



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

227

**CRM-M No.67375 of 2025
Date of decision : 11.12.2025
Date of uploading : 11.12.2025**

Pulkit LakdaPetitioner

Versus

State of HaryanaRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Kushagra Beniwal, Advocate, for the petitioner

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, Senior DAG, Haryana

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.237 dated 07.07.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 109(1), 115, 190, 191(3) & 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') (Sections 238-A & 351(3) of the BNS added and Section 351(2) of the BNS deleted later on) and Sections 25-54-59 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Kunjpura, District Karnal.
2. The gravamen of the FIR in question is that on 07.07.2025, a complaint was submitted by Prem Singh against Pintu, Rohit, Shubham, and Sudhir, along with 7-8 unidentified persons who were present in several vehicles. The complainant stated that on 6.7.2025, his elder son,



namely, Ravinder was standing in the village when a vehicle approached from the opposite side, ran over his foot, and fled from the spot. Shortly thereafter, the same vehicle returned, and Ravinder stopped it. At that time, Rohit, Pintu and some other boys were found inside the car. When Ravinder questioned them about running over his foot, they began abusing and threatening him. Ravinder narrated the entire incident to his father at home. It is further alleged that Pintu later threatened Ravinder over the phone, calling him to Noor Mahal and again warning that he would "see him in the village. On 07.07.2025 at about 2:45 PM, Pintu, Rohit, Shubham, and Sudhir along with 7-8 unknown persons, arrived on the main road of the village in multiple cars, armed with weapons, lathis, and dandas. Acting in concert, they allegedly assaulted Ravinder and his brother Saurabh. The complainant later came to know that the accused had also fired shots at them with the intention to kill. While leaving, the accused allegedly issued life threats, after which Ravinder fled from the spot.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 9.7.2025. Learned counsel has iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner does not specifically figure in the FIR. Learned counsel has further iterated that, assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version is taken to be correct, the role attributed to the petitioner is of firing but the same has not hit anybody.

Learned counsel has further submitted that no fire arm has been recovered



from the petitioner. Learned counsel has further argued that other co-accused have been extended the concession of regular bail. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature, and thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record the custody certificate dated 10.12.2025, in the Court today, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 9.7.2025, whereinafter, investigation was carried out and the challan has been presented on 6.9.2025. Out of total 21 cited prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. Indubitably, culmination of the trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised at Bar given rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 10.12.2025 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 4 months and 27 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in 6 more cases/FIRs. Indubitably, the



antecedents of a person are required to be accounted for while considering a regular bail petition preferred by him. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586*; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of *Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477* & judgments of this Court in *CRM-M No.38822-2022* titled as *Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana*, decided on 29.11.2021, and *Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191*.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.



- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

11.12.2025
Ashwani

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