



CRM-M-18514-2024

1

204
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18514-2024
Date of Decision : 19.09.2024

Rinku
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of U.T. Chandigarh
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Prateek Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Manish Bansal, P.P. for U.T. Chandigarh
Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the complainant

KIRTI SINGH, J.(Oral)

1. Apprehending arrest in FIR No.20 dated 24.02.2024, under Sections 307, 34 IPC and Sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Maloya, U.T. Chandigarh, the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. for grant of anticipatory bail.
2. Succinct factual narrative relevant for the disposal of the instant petition is that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint of Saurav Noni with the allegations that he was having a rivalry with the petitioner for the last one year. On 22.02.2024 at about 9.30 p.m. the petitioner and Varun @ Laddu fired shots upon complainant and his friend with an intention to kill him and then fled away.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and the aforesaid FIR has filed as a counterblast to FIR No. 19 dated 23.02.2024 lodged by the present petitioner,

Wherein gunshots were fired upon the petitioner and his home. He has placed

**CRM-M-18514-2024****2**

reliance upon order dated 04.04.2024 passed in CRM-M-16299-2024 whereby the co-accused namely Varun Gupta @ Laddu has been granted the benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor for U.T. Chandigarh submits that the petitioner has been specifically named in the present FIR. As per allegations in the FIR, the petitioner was present on the alleged date of incident and at the alleged place of crime. It is specifically mentioned in FIR that there was old rivalry between the complainant and the accused person. The petitioner along with co-accused came to their colony and threatened them with dire consequences. It is further alleged that the petitioner fired at the complainant and his friends twice. The entire incident was captured by CCTV cameras and the petitioner can clearly be seen shooting twice at the complainant and his friend. He further submits that the petitioner is also involved in nine other criminal cases and the antecedents reveal that he is a habitual offender. He further submits that in compliance of order dated 16.04.2024 passed by this Court the petitioner has joined investigation but he is not cooperating and the pistol used in the offence is yet to be recovered. He further submits that the petitioner proclaimed himself as a member of Lawrence Bishnoi Gang in order to create fear in the society.

6. Heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. There are serious allegations against the petitioner that he fired at the complainant and the entire incident is captured in the CCTV footage and there are nine other criminal cases registered against the petitioner.

8. In view of the serious allegations leveled against the petitioner and to unearth the true dimension of the alleged crime, this Court does not deem it



CRM-M-18514-2024

3

appropriate to interfere in the matter so as to grant the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.

9. The petition is dismissed.

19.09.2024
reena

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No