



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-42083-2025

Reserved on: 8<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

Pronounced on: 19<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

Shubham Kumar @ Vishu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. P.S. Bindra, Advocate and  
Mr. Aditya Anand, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 28 dated 04.04.2025 registered under Sections 125, 324(4) and 109 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Dorangla, District Gurdaspur, Punjab.

2. As per the allegations, on 03.04.2025, the complainant Baljeet Singh was present at his house along with his family members, when he heard noises of some gunshots and some ruckus on the main gate of his house. He came outside and found three youths with muffled faces present on a motorbike. On seeing him, they fled, while hurling abuses to him. The complainant informed the police and the aforementioned FIR was registered



under Sections 125 and 324 (4) of BNS, read with Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act. On 06.04.2025, secret information was received by the police that the accused were present at Tota Mor and could be apprehended, if a raid was conducted immediately. A police party immediately reached the spot and found the petitioner and co-accused Jaskarn Singh and Gurcharan Singh to be present there. They were apprehended and arrested. On interrogation, they suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the subject crime. On 18.04.2025, the complainant recorded a supplementary statement and identified the petitioner and the co-accused. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of some secret information and supplementary statement of the complainant. He is in custody since 09.04.2025. No case for commission of subject offences has been made out against him. None has sustained any injury in the alleged incident. There is no specific allegation that he was the person, who had fired shots with a firearm on the house of the complainant. Co-accused has been extended benefit of regular bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. The trial would take considerable time to conclude. His custodial interrogation is no more required. He has clean antecedents. Accordingly, it is, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Custody certificate has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, that since the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at



considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have used a firearm by firing shot in front of the house of the complainant and is also alleged to have damaged his property and is further alleged to have made an attempt to kill. No injury, however, had been sustained by anyone in this case. The petitioner was not even named in the FIR and it was only subsequently that his name had cropped up. He does not have any criminal antecedents. The challan has been presented but trial will take time. Further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Given the nature of the allegations and the circumstances as discussed above and on parity, this Court is of the considered opinion that, the petitioner deserves to be released on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**19<sup>th</sup> August, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*  
2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*