



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

109

CRM-M-60848-2025

Date of Decision: 17.04.2026

GAURAV SINGH TANWAR**... PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****... RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Aman Pal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Rishabh Chaudhary, Advocate and
Mr. Pratham Bali, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 99 dated 11.03.2025 under Sections 109(1), 3(5), 61 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act 1959 (Sections 111 (2) (a), 111(3), 111(4), 111(6), 308(2) of BNS and Section 25(1-B) (a), 27 of Arms Act added later on) registered at Police Station Jagadhari City, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that a co-accused of the petitioner allegedly fired at one Rai Singh, who was working as a security guard at H.S. Liquor, resulting in injuries to him. The role attributed to the petitioner is that he was waiting for his co-accused at some distance from the place of occurrence.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not committed any offence. He further submits that the petitioner has not been identified through any test



identification parade and has only been named by the co-accused Vishal, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court. The petitioner has been in custody since 22.03.2025.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner for the grant of regular bail on the ground that the petitioner was present with co-accused Romil who fired gunshots in the premiss of H.S.Liquor. He has filed the custody certificate in Court today and the same is taken on record. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 19 days.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

7. Having noticed the aforesaid facts and circumstances, and considering that apart from the disclosure statement made by the co-accused there is no material evidence to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence; the petitioner is in custody for the last 1 year and 19 days, and although he is involved in one other case in which he is already on bail, and the trial is yet to commence, this Court is of the opinion that continued detention of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose.

8. 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/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.



9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
10. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

17.04.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:		Yes/No