

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

2025:PHHC:110369



218

**CRM-M-7157-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.08.2025.**

Kailash @ Luttas

...Petitioner.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

.....

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Rai, Advocate and
Ms. Sunaina Rani, Advocate for
Mr. A.S. Shera, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nagar Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUKHVINDER KAUR, J. (Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.524 dated 13.11.2024, under Sections 109(1), 3(5) and 351(2) of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Dabua, District Faridabad.

As per prosecution case, the aforesaid FIR was registered on the basis of complaint made by one Charan Singh, wherein he stated that on 12.11.2024, at about 11.43 P.M. Kailash @ Luttas (present petitioner) and his friend came to his vend on Baleno Car and demanded two bottles of beer but refused to pay for the same. When salesman of the vend refused to give beer free of cost, they called up complainant's son Kawaljit but he also refused to give free beer. Thereafter, both of them went outside the vend and

the petitioner fired a shot from a country made gun, which he was carrying with him. Fortunately, the salesman had a narrow escape. As a result of this incident, the police was called on the spot and it was requested to take action against the petitioner and his associate. In these circumstances, the aforesaid FIR was registered against the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that it is no injury case. He has submitted that the matter has already been compromised with complainant (respondent No.2). The petitioner is in custody since 13.11.2024 and as such, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars any longer. He urged that as trial of the case is likely to take time, therefore, the petitioner be granted concession of regular bail.

Notice was issued in this case on 13.02.2025 and status report was called from the State, which was filed on 06.08.2025 and the same has already been placed on record.

Learned State counsel has opposed the petition and submitted that the petitioner fired a shot in order to kill the salesman, who narrowly escaped and another case has also been registered against the petitioner and as such, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

Heard.

As per the allegations, the petitioner fired a shot with the pistol but none was injured in the alleged incident. Affidavit Annexure P1 has been placed on record, as per which, the matter has been compromised with complainant (respondent No.2) on 16.01.2025. This fact was also not disputed by Mr. Nagar Singh, Advocate, who is appearing for respondent No.2 in the present case. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in

custody since 09 months and 07 days. Conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time and no useful purpose would be served by further detaining the petitioner behind the bars any longer.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail, on furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds, to the satisfaction of concerned learned trial Judge/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

However, nothing observed herein above shall be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. The observations recorded above are only for the purpose of deciding the present bail petition.

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

21.08.2025.

Komal

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