



CRM-M-57499-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-57499-2025

Date of Decision: 19.01.2026

Praveen

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate,
Mr. Himanshu Garg, Advocate and
Mr. Praveen Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. AG, Haryana and
Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kartik Mittal, Advocate, for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.219 dated 06.09.2024, registered under Sections 103(1), 61, 61(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25/27/29 of Arms Act (charges against the petitioner framed under Section 29 of the Arms Act only), at Police Station City Mahendergarh, District Mahendergarh.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that FIR in the present case has been lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Dinesh. It was alleged that he got married with Munni Devi (deceased) in the year 1992 in village Sanjarwas, District Dadari. Son of his uncle (Tau) Maniram was also married in the same village to his wife's niece Itu Devi. Itu Devi is the daughter of his brother-in-law Jagdish. It was alleged that there was a dispute between them and litigations were also pending. On account of the same, the complainant and his wife were called at Sadar Police Station, Mahendergarh for recording their statements. Then Mohit, Rohit, Parveen



(petitioner), Vishnu and Itu Devi came to the Police Station and abused his wife and threatened her. Earlier they had falsely implicated his wife and children in a case under Section 302 IPC. When the complainant and his wife were waiting for bus at Mahendergarh Bus Stand, these five persons alongwith others as part of the conspiracy arrived there. They were armed with pistols. Mohit approached his wife, abused her and shot her in her head. The complainant took his wife to the hospital, however, the doctors declared her dead. It was alleged that all these accused in conspiracy with each other had killed her wife and thus, it was prayed that legal action be taken against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Postmortem of the dead body was conducted and statements of the witnesses were recorded. During the investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 04.04.2025. On the completion of the investigation, the Investigating Agency found petitioner Praveen liable to be prosecuted only for the offence under Section 29 of the Arms Act. On the presentation of the challan, the charges were framed and the petitioner was charged for the offence under Section 29 of the Arms Act, whereas, rest of the accused were charged under Section 103 BNS, 2023. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Narnaul praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 29.05.2025. The petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-34490-2025 for the grant of bail, however, the same was dismissed as not pressed by this Court vide order dated 10.07.2025. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular



bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. It is submitted that on account of the civil dispute pending between the parties, all the family members were roped in by the complainant including the petitioner. It is submitted that a thorough and fair investigation was conducted and the allegations against the petitioner regarding conspiracy for murder, were not substantiated and thus, challan was presented against the petitioner only for the offence under Section 29 of the Arms Act. He submits that learned trial Court vide order dated 16.09.2025 has framed charges against the petitioner for the offence under Section 29 of the Arms Act only. He submits that maximum punishment as provided for the offence under Section 29 of the Arms Act, is three years, however, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration of more than seven months. He submits that though the petitioner has been prosecuted in three other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner was not only specifically named in the FIR but has also been attributed a specific overt act. He submits that it was a day light murder and the petitioner alongwith the co-accused had murdered the wife of the complainant, Munni Devi. However, he fairly submits that the order of framing of charges has not been assailed by the prosecution.



5. Learned State counsel has equally controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that weapon of offence used in the crime was supplied by the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is involved in three other cases. However, he has not disputed the fact that the petitioner in the present case is being prosecuted only for the offence under Section 29 of the Arms Act. On instructions, he has submitted that out of total 33 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that though the petitioner was named in the FIR, however, before the trial Court, he is being prosecuted only for the offence under Section 29 of the Arms Act. As submitted before this Court, the petitioner has suffered incarceration of more than seven months. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in three other cases, however, he is on bail in the same.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the

satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

19.01.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No

Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE