



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

CRM-M-46333-2025
Date of decision: 28.08.2025

GARAV ALIAS GARV

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Omkar Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioner.

 Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, DAG, Haryana.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.84 dated 21.03.2025 (Annexure P-1), registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala, under Sections 287, 324(4), 324(5), 308(5), 111(3), 111(5), 61(2) of BNS and 25(1)(B) (a)/29 of Arms Act.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

3. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 20.03.2025, at about 10.00 P.M., complainant Lalit Dhiman parked his car in front of his house. During the intervening night of 20.03.2025 and 21.03.2025 at about 1.30 A.M, he heard the sound of crackers and on the next day at about 7.00A.M, he saw that 2-3 persons had fired gun shots at his car.



With these allegations, the formal FIR got registered. Initially, one Sohan Lal Sharma was arrested, who suffered disclosure statement to the effect that present petitioner had procured weapon from Sohan Lal Sharma and gave it to co-accused namely Manjeet, who had fired shots at the car of the complainant. During investigation, offence under Section 25(6) of Arms Act has also been added and offence under section 25(1)(B)(a) of Arms Act has been deleted and now accused is in custody for the offences under Sections 287, 324(4), 324(5), 308(5), 111(3), 111(5), 61(2) of BNSS and 25(6)/29 of Arms Act. After completion of investigation, challan has been presented for trial.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The offence in question was committed by unknown persons and petitioner has been arrested after he was nominated as an accused by one Sohan Lal Sharma but the disclosure statement of co-accused Sohan Lal Sharma is not admissible in evidence and cannot be used against him. Learned counsel further contended that nothing has been recovered from the possession of petitioner. Petitioner is in custody since 19.04.2025. Investigation has been completed and final report has already been presented. Trial will take sufficiently long time to conclude and petitioner may be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Sukhbir has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has



committed a heinous offence. He is involved in one more case of similar nature and petitioner being habitual offender is not entitled to bail.

6. Offence in question was committed by unknown persons and no one has been named in the FIR. One Sohan Lal Sharma was initially arrested, who nominated the present petitioner as an accused and said Sohan Lal Sharma had allegedly given weapon to him, which was further given to one Manjeet, who fired shot at the car of the complainant. As to how much evidentiary value will be attached to disclosure statement of co-accused will be subject matter of trial. Investigation stands completed and trial is likely to take long time to conclude and further detention of the petitioner is thus not required.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

28.08.2025
Priyanka Thakur

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