



232

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13852-2025

Date of decision : 15.05.2025

Arman Kumar

....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Nirmal Singh,  
Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana assisted by  
ASI Manoj Kumar.

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.210 dated 05.06.2024, under Sections 387, 285, 307, 120-B & 201 of IPC and Section 25(6)/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Karnal.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, KD S/o Karam Singh. It was alleged that he was working as the Gunman of Amrik Singh Virk. On 11.05.2024 his employer received a call through *whatsapp* from a person, namely, Bhanu Rana, who threatened to kill Amrik Singh Virk or any other family member of his in order to extort money from him. Thereafter on 18.05.2024, again an extortion call was made through *whatsapp* from different mobile number. His employer, Amrik Singh Virk, lodged a case No.196 dated 29.05.2024 under Section 387 IPC at Police Station Civil Line Karnal. On 05.06.2024 at about 4:00 P.M., when he was in his office, a young boy who was covering his face, climbed the stairs of



his office and fired from the pistol, he was holding, however, the fire shot did not hit him. He closed the door of the office and thereafter he again fired 02 shots and fled away from the scene of occurrence. It was alleged that this incident had taken place at the behest of Bhanu Rana with intention to extort money from Amrik Singh Virk. The request was made to take legal action against the culprit. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and thus, he was arrested on 11.06.2024. The petitioner disclosed his name 'A', who was found to be less than 18 years of age and thus, he was a Child in Conflict with the law. The petitioner approached the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Karnal vide order dated 18.12.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner was a juvenile at the time of occurrence as is evident from the record. He submits that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR nor any overt act has been attributed against him. He submits that he has been implicated in the present case only on the basis of presumptions and assumptions. He thus, submits that there is no credible evidence against the petitioner. He further submits that the complainant himself did not supported the case of prosecution and has turned hostile. He submits that even otherwise, the petitioner is a juvenile who is behind bars from last about a year and long incarceration of a juvenile is not even advisable, keeping in view his future. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and thus in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner



deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that though the petitioner was a juvenile at the time of occurrence, however, he had played an active role in the commission of offence. He submits that a country made pistol was recovered from the petitioner, besides this, it has been found during investigation, that the mobile phone which was used for giving extortion call belongs to the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner was arrested on the very same day, when the complainant was fired upon. He, on instructions has submitted that out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, only 13 have been examined so far. He has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner on record.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the complicity of the petitioner surfaced in the present case, during the investigation. However, it has been found that the petitioner was a juvenile at the time of occurrence. He was arrested on 11.06.2024. As submitted before this Court, out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, 13 witnesses have been examined. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed an incarceration of 11 months and 03 days as on 14.05.2025. Custody certificate further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after 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 sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the fact that petitioner is a juvenile and long incarceration is likely to affect his future adversely, 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. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15.05.2025

*ps-I*

( RAJESH BHARDWAJ )  
JUDGE

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