



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH.**

227

**CRM-M-30547-2026 (O&M).  
Date of Decision: 01.07.2026.**

Arvind Kumar @ Shelly

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

\*\*\*

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

---

**Present:** Mr. Ashish Pundir, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Sherwal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. Petitioner-Arvind Kumar @ Shelly, aged 25 years, has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS (corresponding Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail in case FIR No.157 dated 29.07.2024 under Sections 287, 62, 3(5), 308(2), 351(2), 111(2)(b) and 111(6) of BNS and Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra.

2. As per version of the FIR, which was got registered at the instance of complainant – Devansh Sharma, while he had gone to the Court, two girls, namely; Annu and Aarti, who works in his office, were sitting on reception informed that today at about 2:10 PM, two boys came to the office, who had wrapped saffron coloured cloth on their faces, loaded a pistol and tried to fire on the glass of the office, but the fire did not happen. Further, it has been got recorded by the complainant that CCTV cameras of the

neighbourhood were checked, in which two accused could be noticed clearly, who were trying to fire shot with their pistol. During investigation those two boys were identified as Amit and Arvind Kumar @ Shelly (petitioner herein).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that material witnesses, i.e., Devansh Sharma, SI Naresh Kumar, SI Surender Kumar, have already been examined fully, and one Annu has also been examined partly, as witnesses No.1 to 4, respectively. Moreover, allegations required to be proved only by establishing the identity of the petitioner and other co-accused, and by explaining their roles in specific, through the CCTV footage, which allegedly was seen from the cameras installed in the neighbourhood area of the shop of the complainant.

Further submits that co-accused Harshit has already been granted bail by this Court, vide order dated 30.10.2025 (Annexure P-2) and petitioner is inside jail since 05.09.2024, i.e., for the last 01 year, 09 months and 24 days and his incarceration for any longer period is not there for any meaningful purpose to either side. Thus, he prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel while producing the custody certificate (which is taken on record), on instructions from SI Jagminder Singh, submits that petitioner is facing trial in four other criminal cases. Thus, being habitual and looking at his conduct, petitioner is not entitled for any concessional relief.

5. In response thereto, Mr. Ashish Pundir, Advocate for the petitioner submits that in fact in none of the cases, petitioner has been convicted till date and in three of the other cases, petitioner is already on bail.

6. As assisted by learned State counsel, out of total 20 prosecution

witnesses, 07 have already been examined. It appears that conclusion of the trial will consume considerable time.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court refrains from commenting upon the factual matrix at this stage, as doing so may cause prejudice to either side. However, it cannot be ignored that the petitioner has been in custody for more than 01 year, 09 months and 24 days, and the material witnesses, including the complainant and other key police officials, have already been examined. The petitioner is not a previous convict, and except for the other case in which he has already been granted bail, there is no involvement of petitioner in any other criminal activity. Co-accused Harshit has already been granted concession of bail. Considering the nature of allegations, stage of trial, and the period of custody already undergone, further detention of the petitioner for an indefinite period would not serve any useful purpose. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the prayer for grant of regular bail.

8. Accordingly, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. However, it is made clear that if petitioner is found directly involved in other similar instances, bail granted in the present case would be sought to be cancelled by the respondent-State immediately.

11. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.
12. Petition stands disposed of.
- Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

01.07.2026  
*jitender*

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