



CRM-M-39422-2025

1

126

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-39422-2025

DECIDED ON: 05.03.2026

RAVI

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Navdeep Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.99, dated 10.03.2019, under Sections 302, 412, 201, 120-B, 34 of IPC, and 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Jhajjar, District Jhajjar.
2. After hearing the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner, on 06.11.2025, following order was passed by this Court:-

“1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.99, dated 10.03.2019, under Sections 302, 412, 201, 120-B, 34 of IPC, and 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Jhajjar, District Jhajjar.

2. FIR was registered on 10.03.2019 at about 05:30 p.m. on the complaint of Sudhir Gulia. As per the complainant, when he was near the school of his brother and conversing with one Azad Chikkara, he suddenly heard the sound of gunshots being fired in the adjoining street. On hearing the shots, both he and Azad Chikkara ran towards the direction of the firing and witnessed 3-4 boys shooting at his brother. Upon seeing them, assailants fled from the spot on their respective motorcycles, carrying their weapons with them. Complainant further stated that about two



years prior to the incident, one Naresh @ Shetty had threatened his brother, Dharmender, while demanding money. On this basis, FIR was registered against Naresh @ Shetty and his associates for the murder of Dharmender.

3. *Counsel for the petitioner contends that although the present petitioner was not named in the FIR, but during the course of investigation, he was found to be one of the main assailants who, along with co-accused Kuldeep and Pawan, had fired upon the deceased, Dharmender. During investigation, one country-made pistol was recovered from the petitioner, along with four other firearms, by the Delhi Police in connection with FIR No.115 dated 28.03.2019 registered at Police Station Crime Branch, Delhi. Out of the five recovered firearms, three were found to match the empty cartridges and fired bullets recovered from the scene of occurrence. In total, eight empty cartridges and two fired bullets were recovered from the spot. On the basis of this evidence, petitioner was challaned by the prosecution as an active participant in the commission of the present offence.*

As per the prosecution, petitioner is also involved in three other cases of murder, namely FIR No.692 of 2016, Police Station City Jhajjar; FIR No.119 of 2019, Police Station City Rai, Sonapat; and FIR No.160 of 2019, Police Station Sadar Jhajjar, in which he has already been sentenced to life imprisonment. Besides these, he is involved in a robbery case registered as FIR No.153 of 2019 at Police Station City Yamunanagar and in a case of attempt to murder registered as FIR No.115 of 2019 at Police Station Crime Branch, Delhi.

4. *Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, places reliance on two bail orders dated 25.03.2022 (Annexure P-2) and 18.07.2022 (Annexure P-3), passed in CRM-M-27476-2021 and CRM-M-15962-2022, respectively, pertaining to co-accused Naveen @ Sonu and Gaurav Khanna. On the strength of these orders, counsel prays that similar relief of bail be granted to the present petitioner as well.*

5. *On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 05.11.2025 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.*

As per custody certificate, petitioner has already undergone the incarceration period of 06 years 05 months and 16 days inside jail.

6. *While referring to the status report dated 27.10.2025 and post-mortem report dated 11.03.2019 of the deceased, Dharmender Gulia @ KK, learned*



State counsel draws attention to the fact that deceased sustained total eight injuries, all of which were caused by the use of firearms.

It is further submitted that, during the course of investigation, empty cartridges and bullets recovered from the spot were found to match the five firearms recovered from the petitioner and his co-accused, namely Kuldeep and Pawan.

7. *Learned State counsel further argues that, as per the details mentioned in paragraph No.7 of the status report, it is evident that petitioner is a habitual offender and gangster involved in several other cases of murder and dacoity.*

It is also informed that petitioner is involved in serious and heinous offences, and as per the custody certificate, he is facing multiple criminal cases registered in the State of Haryana as well as in Delhi. In three of these cases, he has already been convicted.

Learned State counsel additionally submits that out of total 41 prosecution witnesses, 17 have been examined so far, and complainant along with other eye-witnesses are yet to be examined. Thus, he prays for dismissal of the present bail petition.

8. *This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available.*

9. *Without delving into the merits of the case at this stage, this Court would like to apprise itself to the reasons of causing delay in the proceedings and in recording the statements of remaining witnesses, particularly in view of the fact that, as per the custody certificate, petitioner has already undergone an incarceration period of 6 years, 5 months, and 16 days in the present case.*

10. *List again on 10.02.2026.”*

3. Learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 04.03.2026 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

4. As per the custody certificate, petitioner has undergone 03 years 06 months and 17 days period inside jail in the present case.

5. Learned State counsel reiterates the submissions as recorded in the earlier order dated 06.11.2025 and submits that petitioner is a



CRM-M-39422-2025 4

habitual offender, as he is facing multiple criminal cases registered against him in the State of Haryana as well as in Delhi. It is further submitted that in three of the said cases, petitioner has already been convicted.

6. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it.

7. In view of the criminal antecedents of the petitioner and the fact that he has already been convicted in three cases, this Court does not find any substantial ground to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case. Accordingly, present petition stands **dismissed**.

05.03.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>