



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

**CRM-M-48437-2025  
Date of decision: 23.09.2025**

LAKSHMI NARAYAN

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present: Mr. Viren Jain, Advocate and  
Mr. Amandeep Singh Mann, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Navkesh Singh, Advocate  
for victim-Paras Narang.

\*\*\*\*\*

**YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)**

1. Petitioner is praying for regular bail in case FIR No.96, dated 28.07.2025, registered at Police Station Division No.2, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana under Sections 194(2), 125 of BNS and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act (Section 332(c) of BNS and Section 27 of Arms Act added subsequently).
2. Upon notice, learned State counsel has appeared. Both the parties have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.
3. Status report by way of an affidavit of Anil Kumar Bhanot, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police (Central), Ludhiana, filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.



4. Brief facts of the prosecution case are that on 28.07.2025, ASI Malkit Singh received a secret information to the effect that Lakshmi Narayan and his son on the one side and Lovely Narang and his son on the other side have an old property dispute and they have gathered near Sunny temple, where they had altercations and fight and both the parties have committed ruckus, during which, petitioner Lakshmi Narayan fired a shot in the air, which created an atmosphere of terror and endangered the lives of people. With these allegations, formal FIR for the offences under Sections 194(2), 125 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act was registered against all the aforesaid four persons and other unknown persons. It was also revealed that the bullet had hit one Paras Narang on his right thigh, who was medico legally examined at Civil Hospital, Ludhiana. Petitioner was arrested on 28.07.2025 and he got recovered his licensed revolver along with two bullet shells and one live cartridge. During investigation, CCTV footage of the place of occurrence was perused, from which, it was revealed that after the altercation, both the parties went away from the spot but when Lakshmi Narayan and his son Kamal Gour were standing inside their shop, accused Varun Narang son of Lovely Narang along with his cousins Paras Narang and Aryan came at the spot and started beating Lakshmi Narayan and his son, after committing trespass in the shop of Lakshmi Narayan. When they were beating them, Lakshmi Narayan took out his revolver and fired a gunshot and thereafter, his son Kamal Gaur took revolver from him and fired a gunshot and on the basis of this CCTV footage, offence under Section



332-C of BNS and Section 27 of Arms Act were added and Paras Narang and Aryan were nominated as accused vide GDR No.34 dated 29.07.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated. Infact, he was present inside his shop and the opposite party led by Varun Narang and his cousins assaulted him and his son and while acting in self-defence, he had fired a shot, which hit in the thigh of Paras Narang. Learned counsel further contended that he was not the aggressor and infact, it is the opposite party, who was the aggressor and both the parties have put forward their own cross versions. Petitioner is an aged person and is in custody since 28.07.2025. The investigation and trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude and no useful purpose will, thus, be served by detaining the petitioner in custody any more and he may be released on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence and infact, the petitioner and his son had called the victim and his family members for talks but they never assaulted by them and petitioner fired the shot without any provocation and in view of the gravity of offence, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. As per the status report furnished by the State counsel, it is Varun Narang and his companions, who had committed trespass in the shop of the petitioner and assaulted him and his son. Thereafter, he fired the shot in his self-defence and the bullet hit in the thigh of Paras Narang,



which is not a vital part of the body. As such, both the parties have put forward rival contentions, which can be appreciated only after the evidence is led during the trial. Petitioner is in custody since 28.07.2025. The investigation and trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude and no useful purpose will be served by detaining the petitioner in custody.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

9. Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

23.09.2025  
Priyanka Thakur

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)  
JUDGE

|                             |     |    |
|-----------------------------|-----|----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned : | Yes | No |
| Whether Reportable :        | Yes | No |