

2025:PHHC:139967



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

247

**CRM-M No.40021 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 09.10.2025**

Satyaprakash @ Tinku

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Punit Malik, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,  
for the respondent-State

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") for grant of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.40 dated 22.01.2025 registered under Section 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNS") and Sections 25(6) and 25(7) of Arms Act, 1959 (For short "Act, 1959") at Police Station Bhondsi, District Gurugram.

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by Sub Inspector Manoj, Special Task Force alleging

2025:PHHC:139967



therein that on 22.01.2025, he was performing patrolling duty along with other police officials when a secret information was received that the co-accused who had formed an organized crime syndicate engaged in committing different heinous crimes including murder, abduction and extortion and were involved in several cases, were going in a Santro car from Palwal towards Sohna and were carrying weapons. Believing the secret information to be true, a raiding party was immediately formed and nakabandi was formed. A Santro car which was not having any number plate was seen coming from Sohna Gurugram road. It was tried to be stopped by the police officials but the occupants of the same tried to take the car in reverse gear and then tried to flee. The petitioner and one more youth was found sitting in the same. They were apprehended. The petitioner disclosed his name as Satyaprakash @ Tinku and his accomplice disclosed his name as Rahul. On conducting search of the vehicle, four countrymade pistols and ten live cartridges were recovered from them. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner and co-accused Rahul were interrogated and suffered disclosure statements to the effect that they had purchased the weapons recovered from them. They had purchased the recovered weapons from the co-accused Saurav who was also arrested on 30.01.2025. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has

2025:PHHC:139967



been falsely implicated in this case. A false recovery has been planted upon him. He is in custody since 22.01.2025. The ingredient for commission of offence punishable under Section 111 of BNS are not at all attracted against him. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He is on bail in another case registered against him. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to be found in possession of four countrymade pistols and ten live cartridges. He is in custody since 22.01.2025. The trial is likely to take time. It is only on thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial, that it can be concluded as to whether the petitioner was member of an organized crime for committing serious crimes or not. No useful purpose is going to be served by further custody of the petitioner. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case for release of the petitioner on bail is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove

2025:PHHC:139967



shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**09.10.2025**

manju

**(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No