

2025:PHHC:106907



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

234

CRM M-27805-2025

Date of Decision:18.08.2025

Anil

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Surinder Singh Duhan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J.

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the B.N.S.S., 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No.241 dated 23.08.2024 registered under Sections 190, 193(3), 115, 118(1), 324(4), 333, 109(1) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25, 54 and 59 of Arms Act at Police Station Sadar Safidon District Jind (Section 191(3) wrongly typed in the order dated 14.05.2025 passed by Ld. ASJ, Jind in place of 193(3).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that as per the allegations levelled by the complainant, Naveen @ Bholu and Deepak @ Makala had fired shots from their respective country made pistols. The petitioner was simply present at the place of occurrence and he had exhorted the other accused to cause injuries to the injured in the present case. He further contends that 04 persons

were injured, however, they suffered simple injuries. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 04.02.2025 and is in custody for the last about 06 months. Even the *challan* has been presented against him. Learned counsel has also relied upon the order dated 24.04.2025 (Annexure P-2), whereby, Pankaj, a similarly placed co-accused has been admitted to bail.

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 was simply shown to be present at the place of occurrence and had allegedly exhorted the other co-accused to cause injuries to the injured in the offence. The prosecution is yet to lead evidence before the trial Court to prove the charge against the petitioner.

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.

18.08.2025
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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