



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-55762-2025

Date of decision: 12.02.2026

Vicky @ Golu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY

Present: Mr. Shivansh Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Shweta Nahata, DAG, Haryana.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J (ORAL)

1. By virtue of instant petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, petitioner, who is accused in case bearing FIR No.106 dated 25.06.2025 registered against him at Police Station Bahu Akbarpur, District Rohtak, u/s 132,221,109(1),324(3),3(5) of BNS and 25(1-B)(a) of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 61,238(c) of BNS and Section 139 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and Section 29 of the Arms Act, 1959 were added later, prays for grant of regular bail.

2. Relevant facts as emerging from documents on record be noticed hereinbelow:-

SI Sohan Lal set criminal law in motion by filing complaint pointing therein that on 25.06.2025, he along with Constable Naveen, SPO Samunder, ASI Amit and ASI Kuldeep were on patrolling duty and were present at outer bypass of village Mokhra Khas, near the house of accused Rohit @ Raja son of Balwan, when they saw two vehicles standing in front of the house of Rohit. Four young boys came out of the house, two of whom sat in Bolero vehicle and remaining two

sat in a nearby parked Breeza. As soon as they saw the police team, the young



boys tried to speed away in their vehicles. SI Sohan Lal got down from the government vehicle and signalled them to stop, when driver of Bolero vehicle in an attempt to flee away from the site tried to run over him and Constable Naveen, who somehow, were able to save themselves. Driver of Brezza sped towards the village. It is further case of prosecution that after the police officials chased the Bolero vehicle, two boys were apprehended one of whom disclosed his identification details as Rohit @ Raja son of Balwan and also pointed out that while on 'parole' he was visiting his family. He also disclosed that the person, who had fled away in Brezza vehicle, was Pankaj @ Maya.

It is further the case of prosecution that the present petitioner, namely, Vicky @ Golu was also present in Bolero car, from whose personal search, a fully loaded 0.32 Pistol Civil in GSF 1802053560.32 INDIAN ORDNANCE FACTORY IN GSF 180205 along with 07 live cartridges with 7.65 KF embossed thereupon were recovered, who could not produce any valid permit or licence for keeping the aforesaid weapons. Pistol and cartridges were taken into police possession vide separate memo. Present petitioner and his associate namely Rohit @ Raja and Vicky @ Golu were arrested at the site. During interrogation, they confessed to their involvement and disclosed the names of other accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The falsity of the case set up by the prosecution is apparent from the fact that though in the FIR, it is alleged that pistol and 07 live cartridges were recovered from the possession of the petitioner whereas in the Crime Scene Visit Report dated 27.06.2025, it has been mentioned that the pistol was recovered from the vehicle, thus rendering the recovery doubtful. Admittedly, none of the police officials were injured in the incident.

Learned counsel next contends that challan in the present case having been already




the likelihood of completion of trial in the near future is quite remote, for none of prosecution witnesses have been examined. He vehemently contends that simply because the petitioner remains involved in several other criminal cases falsely instituted against him cannot be a ground in itself to deny him the relief so sought for. Prayer for allowing the petitioner has been made.

4. Per contra, while opposing the request for grant of bail, learned State counsel submits that the *petitioner was on Parole*, when on seeing the police team in their official vehicle, he and his accomplice tried to flee away and in this process, they banged into a electric pole. However due to sharp reflexes of police officials, both of them were caught after some chase. It is further the contention of learned State counsel that so called contradiction in the prosecution story with regard to the recovery having been effected from the person of the petitioner or from the vehicle in which he was sitting is too inconsequential to doubt the entire case of prosecution. Further, the effect of these so called contradictions would be adjudicated upon after parties lead their respective evidence. Admittedly, on seeing the police party from a distance, petitioner and his accomplice, who were travelling in Bolero car lost control over their vehicle and while fleeing away, they tried to run over the police officials who somehow were saved.

Learned State counsel next contends that even the past antecedents of petitioner, who has remained involved in 16 other criminal cases of serious nature including several cases under Arms Act and U/ss 392,395,307 IPC) (some of which are registered in Delhi) clearly indicate that he is a habitual offender and if allowed the concession of bail, likelihood of him fleeing from the process of justice by not appearing in the Court as also committing another offence is quite high. Thus, he prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Heard.



5. In view of submissions advanced by learned State counsel but without
adverting to the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the trial, the court is of the
opinion that the petitioner, who is involved in several other criminal cases and
who was on parole, when the incident occurred, is not entitled to the relief of bail.
6. Dismissed.

12.02.2026
manoj

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

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