

2026:PHHC:085581



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

210

CRM M-29835-2026

Date of Decision: 29.05.2026

Uttam Kumar

...Petitioner (s)

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Rupender Hooda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

[Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr. DAG, Haryana.](#)

Mr. Ankit Yadav, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, with a prayer to grant him regular bail in case FIR No. 62 Dated 18.03.2026, under Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, 1959 and 109(1), 61(2), 217 of BNS (corresponding to S. 307, 120-B, 182 of IPC) registered at P.S. Bhuna, District Fatehabad, Haryana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR was initially registered against unknown persons, who had allegedly fired a shot at a salesman in the shop of the complainant with an intention to kill him. The petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor there was any averment, which even connected him with the commission of the crime in any manner. He further contends that the petitioner was nominated as accused in the present case on the basis of the statement made by Dayanand, salesman, and there was no

independent corroboration of the said statement. He further contends that even no person has suffered any injury in the present case and the offence under Section 109(1) of BNS has been wrongly added in the present case. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 23rd March 2026 and is in custody since then. Moreover, while referring to the compromise deed (Annexure P-3), he submits that the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail. However, learned counsel for the complainant submits that he has no objection in case the present petition is allowed.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case, admittedly, the petitioner was not initially named and was arrayed as accused during the course of investigation. Moreover, no person had suffered any injury in the present case and the investigation is almost complete.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

29.05.2026
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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