



131 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-59606-2025
Date of decision: 18.03.2026**

AMAN

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Mr. Manjit Singh Gahlawat, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

Dr. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J (Oral):

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.127, dated 24.04.2025, registered under Sections 109(1), 126, 190, 191(3), 324(4), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25(1-B)(a) and 25(6) of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Narnaund, District Hisar (Annexure-P-1).

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant was being followed by a Scorpio car from which one person fired shots at the complainant, who fortunately dodged the bullet. The petitioner was involved in another FIR No.78/2025 wherein petitioner suffered disclosure statement that some weapons were given to him by Lakshay s/o Yaspal which were to be handed over back to the said Lakshay. Petitioner was apprehended along with illegal weapons in that FIR. However, the petitioner has been named in this FIR by the said Lakshay who stated that



weapons were handed over to him by the present petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. In fact, the present petitioner is being roped in for similar offences for possessing illegal weapons for which he was granted bail in the first FIR. The petitioner has been nominated on the basis of the disclosure statement made by co-accused. The petitioner is in custody for the last 09 months and 17 days.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in view of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. She further submits that as per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 09 months and 17 days.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that apart from the disclosure statement made by the co-accused, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the commission of crime; he is in custody for the last 09 months and 17 days; the trial is yet to commence and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, 'bail is rule and jail is exception'.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the



case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that while on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

18.03.2026
monika

- 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
- 2. Whether reportable : Yes /No