

220

2025:PHHC:110171



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

**CRM M-2243 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.08.2025**

Ravi ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Ajay Kirpal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant a regular bail in case FIR No.52 dated 12.02.2024 registered under Sections 186, 307, 332 and 353 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act at Police Station Civil Line, District Sirsa.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of statement made by Inspector Ravinder Kumar, wherein, it was alleged

that the petitioner and other accused had fired on the police party. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the present case the petitioner had no concern with the alleged crime and had not participated in the occurrence at all. Even, it has been falsely alleged that the accused had fired on the police party as no policeman had suffered any injury in the present case. Learned counsel further submits that Raghav, complainant, Rakesh, Maneka and Manoj Bansal had appeared as witnesses in the main FIR No. 37 dated 09.02.2024 under Section 365 of IPC, Police Station Tosham and had not supported the case of the prosecution. Even, the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 12.02.2024 and is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 06 months. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that in the present case, the prosecution has relied upon 16 witnesses but no witness has been examined so far. Thus, the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 06 months and even the trial has not formally

started against him. Moreover, the private witnesses in the connected case, which is the basis of the present FIR, have not supported the case of the prosecution and have turned hostile.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

21.08.2025
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No