



CRM-M-71189-2025 **1**
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

124 **CRM-M-71189-2025**
Decided on :11.03.2026

Rawta Ram . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. S.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.96 dated 11.07.2025, under Sections 303(2) of BNS and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, and Section 317(2) of BNS (added lateron), registered at Police Station Sangat, District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. FIR was registered against unknown persons, and petitioner's name was not mentioned therein; he was implicated subsequently. Counsel further submits that petitioner has never committed the alleged theft of any vehicle, nor has any stolen vehicle been recovered from his possession. Similarly, alleged recovery of a country-made pistol along with four live cartridges has been planted by the police.

**CRM-M-71189-2025****2**

Counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 11.07.2025. The trial Court has framed charges against the petitioner for possession of a firearm with four live cartridges and possession of a stolen vehicle, all of which are offences triable by the Magistrate. Counsel submits that out of a total of 12 prosecution witnesses, only 3 have been examined so far, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Therefore, prays for grant of regular bail.

3. The facts as argued by the petitioner could not be controverted by the learned State counsel. However, learned State submits that the petitioner was apprehended red-handed with the stolen vehicle, and therefore, no leniency should be granted in considering the prayer for bail.

4. I have heard Learned Counsel for the parties and perused the paper book and the documents appended thereto.

5. Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 11.07.2025, FIR was originally registered against unknown persons, the petitioner was implicated subsequently, and only 03 out of 12 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, this Court is of the considered view that further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Moreover, offences are triable by the Magistrate, and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude.

Without commenting on the merits of the case, present petition is allowed . Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial

**CRM-M-71189-2025****3**

Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate

concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

7. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

11.03.2026***Rashmi****Whether speaking/reasoned:* Yes/No*Whether Reportable:* Yes/No