



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

225-1

**CRM-M-61001-2024 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 20.08.2025**

MOBIN

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.. Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**

**Present:-** Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)**

1. This is the third petition filed under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure, seeking regular bail in FIR No.18 dated 14.02.2019 under Section 307, 285, 457, 380, 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act registered at Police Station Buria, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that some unknown persons stopped the vehicle and fired 07 rounds towards the complainant party with an intention to kill them, however, none of the gunshot(s) hit anybody. The said incident was captured in a CCTV Camera and the petitioner is stated to be not visible in the said CCTV footage, however, he has been arraigned as an accused solely on the statement of his co-accused namely Wakib Ali. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner. The petitioner was produced by way of production warrants as he was already in custody in another case. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further contends that the petitioner has already undergone custody period of 01 year, 02 months and 14 days.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Tapan Masta, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner has undergone custody of 01 year, 02 months and 14 days. He further submits that the petitioner is involved in multiple cases.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is 01 year, 02 months and 14 days; further no evidence is on record to connect the petitioner with the present case and since, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.



10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the petitioner indulges in any offence or does not appear before the Court concerned in the cases pending against him, the bail so granted by this Court shall be considered as cancelled.

**20<sup>th</sup> August, 2025**

*Sonia Puri*

**(H.S. GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

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