



CRM-M-24663-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-24663-2026

Date of Decision: 07.05.2026

Sumer Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Rajat Mor, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Viney Saini, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.309 dated 08.12.2025, registered under Sections 109(1), 351(2), 3(5), 61(2), 62, 238(b) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25(1-B)(a) of the Arms Act, at Police Station Siwani, District Bhiwani.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Anil. It was alleged that about four years ago, he had an altercation with Robin who lived in their neighborhood. After the Panchayat settlement was done in their village, since then Robin, Ranbir and their family members started holding grudge against him and since then they kept on abusing and taunting him. On 07.12.2025, at around 6.30 pm, he was watering his field when Tejpal and Sukhbir alias Sukha came on a motorcycle and behind them Dana alias Sandeep and Sumer (petitioner) also came. Tejpal was holding a pistol in his hand, to which Dana Singh alias Sandeep exhorted to shoot the complainant. On hearing this Tejpal pointed the pistol at him and tried to fire at him with the intention of killing him but the pistol got stuck and Tejpal pressed the trigger two-three times but the pistol did not fire. The complainant ran to



save his life and entered the house of Hoshiyaar Singh. They all fled away from the spot after threatening to kill him. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 08.12.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bhiwani praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the bail application filed by both the petitioner vide order dated 21.04.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He contends that the alleged occurrence took place on 07.12.2025. It is contended that co-accused Tejpal was armed with the pistol and tried to fire at the complainant, but the pistol got stuck and thus, he could not fire and the petitioner was also accompanying with him. He contends that it is a case of no injury as per the admitted case of the prosecution. However, the petitioner was alleged to be present at the time of occurrence, but later on during investigation, in a premeditated manner, he has been alleged to be the supplier of the fire arm and thus, false implication of the petitioner is writ large. He further submits that the investigation is complete and the petitioner is behind the bars since the date of his arrest. He contends that though the petitioner is involved in four other cases, however, in two cases, he is on bail and in rest two cases, he has been acquitted. He,



thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that though it is a case of no injury, however, during the investigation, the petitioner is found to be the supplier of the fire arm to co-accused Tejpal. Recovery of weapon has also been effected from the petitioner. On instructions, he has submitted that investigation is complete and charges are yet to be framed.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that initially the allegations against the petitioner are that he was present at the place of occurrence alongwith the co-accused Tejpal and he was unarmed. However, during the investigation, he has been alleged to have supplied the fire arm weapon to the co-accused Tejpal. Admittedly, it is a case of no injury as the firing of the shot could not take place as the pistol got stuck. As submitted before this Court, the petitioner is stated to be involved in four other cases, however, out of which in two cases, he is on bail and in two cases, he has been acquitted. Investigation is complete.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.



CRM-M-24663-2026

-4-

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.
8. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.
9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

07.05.2026
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No