



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(112) CRM-M-64224-2025 (O & M)
Date of decision: 07.03.2026

Ravish Kumar

.... Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Reshabh Bajaj, Advocate and
Mr. Harmeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Viney Phogat, DAG, Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

At the very outset, on the oral request of the learned counsel for the petitioner, Sections 351(3), 238(2), and 61(2) of BNS and Section 25(1B)a-54-54A of the Arms Act, are ordered to be added in the head note as well as in the prayer clause of the present petition.

2. The prayer in this petition under Section 483 BNSS is for the grant of the regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.183 of 2025 dated 09.09.2025 under Sections 126, 140(1), 3(5) of BNS (Sections 351(3), 238(2), 126(2) and 61(2) of BNS and Section 25, 25(1B)a-54-54A, 59 of the Arms Act 1959 added later on) registered at Police Station Sector 31, Faridabad, Haryana.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is not named in the FIR. Even as per the prosecution case, the role of the petitioner is that he provided safe harbour to the accused-Vineet and Ajeet. As the petitioner is in custody since 18.09.2025 but none of the 17



prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, while referring to the status report dated 21.01.2026 which is already on record, contends that the petitioner provided Rs.5,000/- each to accused-Vineet and Ajeet required for commission of offence and he was actively involved in harbouring them by providing a motor cycle owned by co-accused/Umresh and also provided a SIM card with the KYC of one Santan of their village Uchala, thus, helped them in evading arrest from the police. He also helped them in concealing the looted money. The nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious and heinous and therefore, he is not entitled to the concession of bail. It is, however, conceded that the petitioner is in custody since 18.09.2025 but none of the 17 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. The veracity of the prosecution case against petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the trial. Admittedly, he is in custody since 18.09.2025 and none of the 17 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. Therefore, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-Ravish Kumar is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.



8. The petitioner shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that he is not involved in any other case/crime other than the present one.
9. If any attempt whatsoever is made by the petitioner and/or his family members/friends to contact/threaten/intimidate any of the witnesses of the present occurrence, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this order.
10. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from Trial without sufficient cause.
11. The petition stands disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

March 07, 2026
sukhpreet

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