



249

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

**CRM-M-25616-2025  
Date of Decision:17.07.2025**

YUVRAJ ALIAS YUVI

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

**Coram :** Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**Present :** Mr. Sahil Goel, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.42 dated 07.03.2025, registered under Sections 309(4), 3(5), 61(2), 238(B) of BNS 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station Chhachhrauli District Yamuna Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR was initially got registered by Somesh Garg, the complainant against 03 unknown persons, who had allegedly committed robbery at his shop. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 10.03.2025, only on the basis of suspicion. However, no gold chain or any other incriminating evidence was recovered from him. After his arrest, the investigation has been completed



and challan has been presented against him. By referring to orders Annexures P-2 and P-3, learned counsel submits that Parshant @ Lucky and Anuraj @ Joban have already been granted the concession of regular bails by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhri. Even the allegations against both the accused were almost similar and on parity also the petitioner deserves to grant on bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is the main accused and he had entered the shop with a gun to commit the robbery and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. He has also filed reply by way of an affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bilaspur, District Yamuna Nagar on behalf of the respondent-State and the same is taken on record.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner was initially not named in the FIR and his name cropped up as an accused only during the course of investigation. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 10.03.2025 is in custody since than. After completion of investigation, the challan has been presented against him and the petitioner may not be required for the purpose of investigation. Moreover, the petitioner is a first offender. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his



furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

**17.07.2025**  
*vipin*

**(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

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