



CRM-M-32520-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Sr. No.103**Case No. : CRM-M-32520-2025****Decided On : August 20, 2025**

Sunil Kumar Petitioner
vs.
State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR.

* * *

Present : Mr.Ajay Kalra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. R. K. Singla, Addl. A. G., Haryana.

* * *

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. :

Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.0096 dated 03.04.2025, under Sections 25(1-B)(a), 25(8) of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Rai, District Sonapat.

The brief facts of the case in hand are that the aforesaid FIR was registered on the basis of secret information, informing that three persons namely Mehak @ Hunny, Ankit and Rinku @ Chhota could be apprehended with arms as they were sitting in a Wagon-R car and all of them were indulged in trading of illegal weapons. The police took immediate action and raid was conducted at the disclosed place. All the three aforementioned persons were found present at the spot with their car. The car was thoroughly searched and eight country-made pistols, five magazines



and two live cartridges were recovered. On asking, none of the persons could show any license or permit for keeping the arms with them. During investigation, while recording disclosure statements of the above three accused persons, it came to light that the petitioner Sunil Kumar used to supply the weapons. Further investigation also revealed that the petitioner and his wife received amount of Rs.2,00,000/- and it was alleged that the said amount was received by them only in lieu of selling the weapons. In this way, name of the petitioner cropped up in the case in hand, during investigation of the case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is not connected with the offence in the present case and he has not been named in the FIR. He has been nominated as accused only on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused, which is not admissible in law. No other incriminating evidence against the petitioner has been brought on record. The alleged amount of money received in the bank account of the petitioner is not in respect of the transactions in arms. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and since custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for any purpose, he be granted concession of anticipatory bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the present bail petition while contending that the petitioner has been specifically named by the co-accused in his disclosure statement and there are serious allegations against him that he had been indulging in trafficking of arms. While referring to the Status Report, already placed on record, learned State counsel also submitted that 03 more FIRs of similar nature have been registered against the petitioner. It has, therefore, been prayed



that the petitioner be not granted any concession of bail, as prayed for.

In the present case, initially the name of the petitioner was not mentioned in the FIR. His name cropped up during investigation when he was named by the co-accused Mehak @ Hunny in his disclosure statement. As per the allegations, the petitioner was supplier of arms and the co-accused had also brought from him eight country-made pistols, five magazines and two live cartridges, which had been allegedly recovered in the present case. During investigation, the bank record was also obtained, as per which, co-accused Mehak @ Hunny had transferred various amounts in the bank account of the petitioner on different dates, which also shows involvement and active participation of the petitioner in the offence in the present case.

Keeping in view the peculiar circumstances of the case and specific allegations regarding involvement of the petitioner in arms trafficking, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required so as to find out the source from where the petitioner had been bringing the illegal weapons and also to unearth the actual facts relating to the present case. So, no ground for granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner is made out.

Dismissed.

Pending applications(s), if any, shall stand disposed of along with the present petition.

August 20, 2025

monika

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>

2025.PHHC:109201



CRM-M-32520-2025

4