

2025:PHHC:082564



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

**113+236**

**CRM-25113-2025 in/and  
CRM-M No.30286 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 07.07.2025**

Saurav

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Vaibhav Parashar, Advocate,  
for the applicant-petitioner.

Ms. Sheenu Sura, DAG, Haryana,  
for the respondent-State

\*\*\*

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

**CRM-25113-2025**

Prayer in this application has been made by the applicant for granting permission to place on record copies of certain FIRs registered against him.

The application is allowed subject to just exceptions and copies of the aforementioned FIRs are ordered to be placed on record as Annexures P-3 to P-9 respectively.

**Main Petition**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short

2025:PHHC:082564



“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 Section 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 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. Two youths who were sitting in the same were apprehended and they disclosed their names as Satyaprakash @ Tinku and Rahul. On conducting search of the vehicle, four countrymade pistols and ten live cartridges were recovered from them. A case under Section 111(4) of BNS read with Section 25 of Act, 1959 was registered.

2025:PHHC:082564



Investigation proceedings were initiated. The accused Satyaprakash @ Tinku and Rahul suffered disclosure statements to the effect that the weapons had been procured by them from the present petitioner. On the basis of their disclosure statements, the petitioner was nominated as accused. He was arrested and is in custody since 30.01.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since long. No recovery has been effected from him. The trial would take considerable time to conclude. The allegations that he was supplier of firearms, are false. He has been acquitted in one of the seven cases registered against him. His involvement in other cases cannot be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. It is, therefore, argued that the petition filed by him deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender since as many as seven other cases were registered against him. There are chances of his committing similar offences or absconding if extended benefit of bail. There are serious allegations against him. It is, therefore, argued that he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have supplied firearms in big quantity to the co-accused and is further alleged to be involved in the

2025:PHHC:082564



business of supplying such firearms and being member of such organized gang for committing serious crime. He does not have clean antecedents since seven other cases of similar nature and even having graver allegations have been registered against him. The trial has commenced and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. Gravity of the allegations is an important ground while considering a plea of an accused for grant of bail. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations, the antecedents of the petitioner, the apprehension expressed by the State that he may commit similar offences again cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.07.2025  
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No