



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

112+115

Date of decision: 27.02.2026

CRM-M-52030-2025

SACHIN ALIAS PARSHANTPetitioner
VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CRM-M-71455-2025

GAUTAM NARANGPetitioner
VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-52030-2025.
(Through Video Conferencing).

Mr. Parshant Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-71455-2025.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Both these petitions having been filed by the two accused in the same FIR, are being decided by a common order.
2. The petitioner(s) herein are seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 565 dated 20.12.2024, registered under Section(s) Section 25 of the

Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 109(2), 115, 121(2), 132, 190, 191(2)/ 191(3), 221, 262, 263(a) of BNS, 2023 (Section 111 of the BNS, 2023 added later on) registered at Police Station Sadar Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.

3. For the facility of reference, the facts are being referred to from CRM-M-52030-2025. The case of the prosecution as mentioned in the order of the trial Court as under:-

“Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this application are that present case was registered on the statement so made by complainant ASI Anil Kumar, No.2283/FBD, posted with Escort Guard, Faridabad. It has been alleged therein that on 20.12.2024, as per official duty, he along with EHC Deepak No. 1023/FBD, Constable Narendra No.965/FBD, and Constable Surjeet Singh No.361/FBD, departed from Police Lines, Faridabad at about 07:00 AM in government vehicle HR-87GV-8864 (white Scorpio) driven by Driver Dharmendra No.102, for the purpose of producing prisoner Ravi s/o Ram Mehar, ro Jagsi, District Sonipat (under FIR No. 79 dated 28.03.2021, u/s 25-54-59 Arms Act, P.S. Sadar, Fatehabad) from Neemka Jail, Faridabad before the Court of Shri Hemant Yadav, learned ASJ, Fatehabad. For security purposes, Constable Narendra was armed with a government-issued carbine butt No.18620105 containing 10 live rounds and Constable Surjeet Singh was armed with a government-issued carbine butt No.16009043 containing 10 live rounds. At about 12:30 PM, the said prisoner was produced before the Hon'ble Court and, upon obtaining the requisite warrants, they commenced the return journey to lodge him back in Neemka Jail. At about 01:50 PM, upon reaching NH-9 near Badopal Canal Bridge, the prisoner requested to relieve himself urgently. The escort party halted at Top

Family Dhaba for this purpose. After the prisoner used the washroom, the party took tea and then proceeded to escort him back to the official vehicle. At that moment, a black Scorpio vehicle arrived, from which 6-7 unidentified young persons, armed with pistols and country-made firearms, alighted at speed. They openly exhorted prisoner Ravi to escape from police custody and started firing upon the police party with intent to kill. One of the assailants, known to him as Ankit, opened indiscriminate fire directly at him. Simultaneously, the remaining assailants, including Ankit, Manoj, Jelly, Ravindra (names heard being called by Ankit during the incident), fired at the escort party to secure the prisoner's release. In self-defence and in an attempt to prevent the prisoner's escape, he issued a lawful warning to the attackers. Constable Surjeet Singh then discharged one round in the air from his carbine. In retaliation, Ankit fired directly at Constable Surjeet Singh, striking him on his left hand. The assailants continued to fire while retreating with the prisoner. Constables Surjeet Singh and Narendra, in exercise of lawful powers under Sections 46 and 100 CrPC, discharged rounds aiming at the lower limbs of the assailants and the prisoner to disable them. During this exchange, prisoner Ravi sustained a gunshot injury to his waist, and one unidentified assailant also received a bullet injury. Both fell to the ground incapacitated. Despite ongoing fire from the remaining assailants, the escort party secured injured Constable Surjeet Singh and prisoner Ravi in the official vehicle, informed Dial-112, and transported them to Government Hospital, Fatehabad. Upon examination, the attending doctor declared prisoner Ravi brought dead and commenced medical treatment of Constable Surjeet Singh. From the utterances during the attack, it is established that Ankit, along with Manoj, Jelly, Ravindra,

and other unidentified accused, conspired and executed a lethal armed assault on the police escort party with the object of forcibly releasing prisoner Ravi from lawful custody. He prayed for taking legal action against accused persons.”

4. Learned State Counsel contends that one Ravi Kumar, a hardened criminal and gangster involved in as many as 29 cases had been produced before the trial Court i.e. Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad. It is submitted that an attempt was made to free the said accused-Ravi Kumar who while being ferried, got the Police vehicle stopped on the pretext of answering the call of nature, whereupon an attack was opened upon the Police party. There were five persons who were armed and opened gunfire and as a result of the cross-fire, one assailant died on the spot while one died on the way to the Hospital. It is contended so far as the petitioner-Sachin @ Parshant (Petitioner in CRM-M-52030-2025) is concerned, he is brother-in-law of the deceased gangster Ravi Kumar and that he had undertaken the reccee and facilitated the attempted escape of Ravi Kumar. It is further alleged that in relation to Gautam Narang (Petitioner in CRM-M-71455-2025), his car was used by the assailants in carrying out the incident in question. It is contended that the weapon in question had been obtained from Akshay @ Rajput (Petitioner in CRM-M-8609-2026 which has been withdrawn today). It is alleged that the petitioner(s) had thus conspired with all the other assailants in facilitating the attempted escape of the gangster Ravi Kumar. It is also contended that Police Official(s) sustained injuries in the said case.

5. Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s)-Gautam Narang contends that his car had been borrowed by his neighbour Manoj @

Mauji for attending a wedding function and that in good faith, he handed over the said car as he was unaware of the criminal antecedents of Manoj @ Mauji. It is further argued that there is no other criminal case registered against the petitioner and he is in custody since 18.08.2025. The investigation qua him is complete and no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from him.

6. Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s)-Sachin @ Parshant submits that the petitioner is in custody since 07.01.2025 and has been nominated as an accused solely because of his familial relation with the gangster-Ravi Kumar. He contends that the very fact that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused for commission of offence under Section 498-A of the IPC at the behest of his wife (sister of the deceased gangster-Ravi Kumar), there is hardly any possibility of the petitioner facilitating any act for securing release of his brother-in-law- Ravi Kumar.

7. On a pointed query, Counsel for the respondent-State submits that there are total 67 witnesses to be examined by the prosecution and no witnesses has been examined so far. It is also not disputed by the learned State Counsel that the persons who were present at the spot and opened fire at the police party have all been arrested and are since then in custody.

8. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner(s), the absence of recovery, the nomination on the basis of the disclosure statement, the stage of the trial as well as the period of custody already undergone, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner(s) on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

9. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner(s) is ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

10. It is made clear that the petitioner(s) shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

FEBRUARY 27, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No