



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-29640-2025 (O&M)

Ravi Boxer

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	17.03.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	20.03.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	20.03.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

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

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana.

Ms. Garima Dikshit, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No. 736, dated 17.10.2024, registered under Sections 103(1), 190 and 191(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 61(2), 111(2) and 115(5) of BNS, 2023 added later on) at Police Station



2026:PHHC:043787



Barwala, District Hisar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Rohtash on 17.10.2024 alleging therein that on the same day at about 8:15 AM, he heard the sound of gunshots near the shop of his brother Sonu. Upon reaching there, he saw several persons, namely Maindku, Maat, Amit, Ajay, Lavish @ Mandis and two other persons of village Samain present at the spot armed with pistols. They had surrounded Sonu from different directions and they fired gunshots at him. Thereafter, all the assailants fled from the spot on a Bullet motorcycle and three other motorcycles while brandishing pistols. Sonu sustained gunshot injuries and succumbed to the same. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The post-mortem examination of the dead body of the victim and inquest proceedings were conducted. On 23.10.2024, accused Naveen, Sonu @ Dangi, Amit @ Mama and Rakesh @ Mogli were arrested. They were found to be habitual offenders. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the subject offences. Accused Amit disclosed that it was the petitioner, who had dropped them at the house of accused Sonu after committing murder of victim Sonu on the fateful day. The petitioner was arrested on 27.10.2024. During interrogation, he disclosed that he had provided food, shelter and logistical support to the co-accused for committing murder of the victim. Recovery of weapons of crime was effected. After completion of necessary investigation and usual formalities, challan was presented in the Court and presently, the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.



2026:PHHC:043787



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement of the above named co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. He was not present at the place of occurrence. No overt act is attributed to him. The only role attributed to him is that he had dropped the accused persons at the house of accused Sonu after the occurrence. He in custody since 27.10.2024. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been presented. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. His involvement in other cases cannot be made a ground for denying him the benefit of bail in the given circumstances. Continued detention of the petitioner is not going to serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that there are quite serious allegations against the petitioner, who, by hatching a criminal conspiracy with the co-accused, had facilitated the commission of murder of the victim by providing shelter, financial assistance as well as logistical support to the co-accused. He has clean antecedents and has been convicted in another case. There are chances of the petitioner's absconding or committing similar offences, if released on bail. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, is alleged to have extended active assistance to the co-accused by providing



2026:PHHC:043787



shelter, food and logistical support immediately before and after the commission of the offence. The disclosure statements of the co-accused, though subject to evidentiary scrutiny at trial, cannot be brushed aside at this stage when it forms part of the chain of circumstances pointing towards the petitioner's involvement in the larger conspiracy. The role attributed to the petitioner suggests facilitation of the crime, which, at this stage, attracts the rigours of criminal conspiracy and abetment. Further, the petitioner does not appear to be a person of clean antecedents as he is stated to have been convicted in another criminal case. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. While length of incarceration is a factor that weighs with the Court in considering bail, it cannot overshadow the seriousness of the accusation of murder under Section 302 of IPC. There exists a genuine apprehension that his release may imperil the course of trial and undermine the integrity of the trial and could pose a risk by influencing unexamined witnesses or tampering with evidence. It is well-settled proposition of law that grant of bail is a discretionary relief to be granted or denied based on specific facts and circumstance of each case and there cannot be any exhaustive parameters set out for considering the application for grant of bail. The factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the complainant is also to be weighed. Frivolity of prosecution should always be considered, and it is only the element of genuineness that has to be considered in the matter of grant of bail. In light of the foregoing legal principles, this Court finds no compelling ground to grant bail to the petitioner.



CRM-M-29640-2025 (O&M)

-5-2026:PHHC:043787

2026:PHHC:043787



Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

7. It is clarified that any observation made in this order is only for deciding this petition and shall not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on merits.

20.03.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No