



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

245

\*\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M No.45988 of 2025  
Date of decision : 27.8.2025**

**Pankaj @ Pinku****.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Haryana****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate and  
Mr. Sanjeev Kadian, Advocate, for the petitioner

Mr. Vishal Singh, AAG, Haryana

---

**SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)**

1. Present 2<sup>nd</sup> petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.188 dated 20.5.2025, under Sections 25(1-B)(a) and 25(6) of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Gohana, District Sonapat.
2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that the petitioner is an accused of being involved in FIR pertaining to Arms Act, 1959 involving one pistol 315 bore, 2 live cartridges of 315 bore, one pistol desi dogra 12 bore and 2 live rounds of 12 bore, one pistol 32 bore and one live round of 32 bore allegedly recovered from the petitioner on his identification from the bushes on the canal bank on the road from Bhainswal Kalan to Guhna village on 19.5.2025.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 20.5.2025. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further iterated that there were earlier FIR(s) registered against the petitioner and thus the police has foisted the instant case on him. Learned counsel has further argued that the recovery is tainted in terms of mandatory provisions of law. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 26.8.2025 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 20.5.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out and challan stands presented on 7.8.2025. Total 20 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date. It is thus indubitable that culmination of the trial emanating will take its own time. The rival contentions raised by learned counsel give rise to debatable issues which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the



likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 26.8.2025 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 3 months and 7 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in multiple FIRs. Indubitably, the antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

6.2 Indubitably, the present petition is the second attempt by the petitioner to secure regular bail. The first bail petition at the instance of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn on 22.7.2025, as, at that time, the investigation was still going on and challan was not presented. Keeping in view the challan having been presented and the extended



period of custody for about a month, this Court is inclined to affirmatively consider the petition in hand.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.
- (viii) The petitioner shall submit, on the first working day of every month, an affidavit, before the concerned trial Court, to the effect that he has not been involved in commission of any offence after being released on bail. In case the petitioner is found to be involved in any offence after his being enlarged on bail in the present FIR, on the basis of his affidavit or otherwise,



the State is mandated to move, forthwith, for cancellation of his bail which plea, but of course, shall be ratiocinated upon merits thereof.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**(SUMEET GOEL)**  
**JUDGE**

**27.8.2025.**

*Ashwanii*

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/No