



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

128

CRM-M-69223-2025
Date of decision: 01.04.2026

SOMBIR ALIAS DHOLIA

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Ms. Rimpay, Advocate (Legal Aid Counsel)
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Talwar, Senior DAG, Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 120 dated 11.05.2024, registered under Section(s) 147, 149, 120-B, 307 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Beri, District Jhajjar.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of one Mahesh son of Jagdish. The same reads thus:-

On 10.05.2024, I and my son Sahil came to Beri village for the wedding of my nephew Amit son of Anil Kumar, resident of Fatehgarh District Charkhi Dadri. I was in a separate car and Sahil had come in a hired separate car. Sahil

was driving Breezaa while number HR-130-5873 himself and his friends/relatives Mohit, Balraj and Sahil were also in the car with him. When we reached near Jat Dharamshala on Gochhi road in Beri at around 10.00 PM, two boys came riding a bike and stopped near Sahil's car and started asking Sahil something. During this time, one of the boys shot Sahil and both the boys riding the bike fled from there. Then with the help of other known persons, I brought my son Sahil to PGI Rohtak for treatment.

3. It has been noticed by this Court that since the filing of the present petition in the year 2025, Counsel for the petitioner has chosen not to appear on any dates. The position remains unchanged today as well. Hence, this Court deems appropriate to proceed the case on merits after nominating a Legal Aid Counsel. Accordingly Ms. Rimpay, Advocate, Enrollment No. PH/2748/2024, Mobile No. 6284533905 who is present in the Court is appointed as a Legal Aid Counsel to assist this Court on behalf of the petitioner. She has gone through the paper book supplied by the learned State Counsel and submits that as per the averments contained in the petition, the petitioner is in custody since 17.05.2024 and has already undergone a custody of nearly 01 year and 11 months. It is further submitted that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor any specific role has been attributed. There are total 27 prosecution witnesses and the material witnesses already stand examined. She contends that as per the FIR, there is no direct attribution of any fire arm injury to the petitioner but general allegation with respect to the fire arm injury having been caused by one of the assailant, has been raised. It is contended that taking into consideration the nature of the allegations, the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner as well as the fact that the material witnesses have already been

examined, the present petition be allowed and the petitioner be released on bail.

4. Learned State Counsel, however, contends that even though the general averments had been raised about some of the assailants having fired shot, however, during the course of investigation it transpired that it was the petitioner who fired the shot. Hence, the other co-accused have been granted concession of bail by the Court vide orders of different dates. It is further contended that so far as the petitioner is concerned, he is a history sheeter who is involved in as many as 12 other FIRs which also include FIRs for heinous offences including under the Arms Act, snatching as well as attempt to murder. There are as many as two other cases for commission of offence under Section 307 IPC viz. attempt to murder while there are 05 other cases under the Arms Act. He submits that three witnesses out of 27 witnesses have been already examined, however, taking into consideration the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Taking into consideration that post investigation, a specific case has been made against the petitioner to the effect that he has fired the shots and further taking into consideration the involvement of the petitioner in a large number of cases including two other cases under Section 307 IPC and 05 other cases under the Arms Act and other cases for different offences under IPC, I am of the opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail at this stage. The present petition is accordingly

dismissed. The trial Court is, however, requested to take appropriate steps for an expeditious conclusion of the prosecution evidence.

7. A copy of this order be sent to the High Court Legal Service Committee for information and necessary action.

APRIL 01, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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