



CRM-M-22090-2026 (O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-22090-2026 (O&M)

Reserved on: 27.04.2026

Pronounced on: 29.04.2026

Uploaded on: 29.04.2026

SANDEEP KUMAR

PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Argued by: Mr. Karan Vir Nanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, DAG Punjab.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.373 dated 05.08.2025 under Sections 115(2), 109, 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Zirakpur, District SAS Nagar, Mohali, Punjab. Section 74 BNS was added in the FIR during investigation. This is the second petition for regular bail. The first one was dismissed as withdrawn on 24.02.2026.

2. Complainant Poonam Sharma w/o Rohtas Sharma reported that on 05.08.2025, when she and her brother Ravi s/o Kalu Ram were present in Flat No.C-4, Dev Bhoomi Homes, Zirakpur at around 12:10 A.M., Sandeep Kumar s/o Baljinder Singh, resident of House No.765, Raipur, District Mansa arrived and started asking her the whereabouts of a person living in Flat C-5. When she told him that she was not aware, he entered in her room. She protested and Sandeep Kumar, who was drunk, grabbed the collar of her T-shirt. She raised alarm on which her brother Ravi arrived. The assailant started abusing her brother, grabbed him by his hair and forcibly dragged him down

**CRM-M-22090-2026 (O&M)**

from the third floor. With the intention of killing her brother Ravi, Sandeep Kumar shot him with revolver which hit her brother on the face. Hearing the sound of the bullet, their neighbour Suresh came to rescue them. Accused Sandeep Kumar also shot Suresh, which hit him on the ear. He came on *Tata Tiago* car bearing registration No.PB-51-C-2807. Later, seeing crowd of people, he fled away on his car.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the course of trial, statements of complainant Poonam Sharma and injured Ravi as well as Suresh were recorded. None of them supported prosecution case and pleaded complete ignorance of the facts. Petitioner, who was in custody with effect from 06.08.2025, thus, deserved to be released on regular bail, given his clean antecedents.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail in view of serious nature of allegations against the petitioner.

5. Considering the fact that statements of complainant and both injured witnesses have been recorded, period of custody undergone i.e. more than 8 months, clean antecedents of the petitioner, the petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

6. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

29.04.2026
HS.CHAUHAN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No