



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

**CRM-M-24915-2025  
Reserved on: 9<sup>th</sup> July, 2025  
Pronounced on: 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025**

Pardeep Kumar @ Banu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Rajesh K. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

The instant one is the second petition 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. 17 dated 11.02.2024 registered under Sections 386, 307, 506, 120-B of IPC and Sections 25 (6) and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 482 and 411 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Mahilpur, District Hoshiarpur, Punjab. His previous petition bearing CRM-M-55579-2024 has been dismissed vide order dated 26.03.2025.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Harjot Singh, who was running a shop alleging therein that on 11.02.2024, he was cleaning his shop at about 10:15 AM, when three muffled face youths came in a black colour



motorcycle and started firing shots with a firearm at the flex board of his shop. Thereafter, one of them, handed over one paper slip to his assistant Ravi Kumar and then they fled away while firing shots towards Ravi, who had a narrow escape. On going through the paper slip, the complainant found that it was containing the writing “Kaushal Choudhary Group 5 crore W.No. +393533401161”. FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, accused Manisha wife of Kaushal Choudhary, who is a gangster was arrested. She suffered a disclosure statement. On 19.03.2024, on the basis of a secret information, accused Banwari Lal was nominated as such. He was arrested and suffered disclosure statement to the effect that on the asking of one Ghanshaym, member of Kaushal Choudhary gang, he along with the petitioner and another shooter had committed the offence of firing shots at the shop of the complainant. The petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was arrested on 13.04.2024. One mobile phone containing two SIM cards and two pistols were recovered from his custody. In pursuance of his disclosure statement, some other accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The disclosure statement of the co-accused, on the basis of which he had been implicated, cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He has been released in another case registered against him and the same is a new ground for seeking bail in this case. He is in custody since long. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.



4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. He has criminal antecedents as he is involved in two more cases of serious nature. His previous bail petition was dismissed after making detailed discussion only on 26.03.2025. No new substantive or specious ground has been made out for allowing this petition. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have formed a gang involved in business of extorting ransom money by extending threats to businessmen and rich people. He in connivance with the co-accused and along with two co-accused went outside the shop of the complainant on the fateful day and fired shots with intent to overawe the complainant and to extort money from him. He was identified by complainant as one of the assailants. His previous petition had been dismissed only on 26.03.2025. This petition has been filed with a new ground to the effect that he has been released on bail in another case. His release in another case cannot be stated to be amounting to substantive or specious change in circumstances. The previous petition, as filed by the petitioner, had been dismissed by passing a detailed order and taking into consideration all the contentions raised by him. There is no substantive or specious change in the circumstances from the date of dismissal of the previous petition as filed by the petitioner. It is also well settled that there must be drastic change during the period between two applications for the



successive application to be allowed, which is not the position in this case. As such, I see no ground to allow the petition. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

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 dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

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

**11<sup>th</sup> July, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

*1. Whether speaking/ reasoned*

*: Yes / No*

*2. Whether reportable*

*: Yes / No*