



CRM-M-16547-2025

-1-

204

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16547-2025

Date of Decision: 08.07.2025

SUNIL KUMAR @ SHILU

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.186 dated 20.09.2024, registered under Sections 3(5), 61, 109(1) of B.N.S. and Sections 25, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, at Police Station Raipur Rani, Panchkula.

2. As per allegations in the FIR, one Goldy received gunshot injury in chest, statedly given by co-accused Dhruv Garg. Another co-accused Gursewak is accused causing injuries to complainant Dinesh alias D.K. on



CRM-M-16547-2025

-2-

finger. The third accused Akshit statedly waited for other accused on his bike. The petitioner has not been attributed any role in the entire case, nor has any injury been attributed to him. The only ground on which he has been implicated is that he provided mobile number of co-accused Vishal alias Goda to co-accused Harsimran Singh Simu, who is stated to have animosity with Goldy.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the alleged offences are not made out against him. Besides, trial of the case is not progressing as none out of total 52 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. The petitioner is in custody since 04.10.2024.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the petitioner's custody nor the fact that none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. He submits, trial is fixed for 20.08.2025; thereupon, the prosecution witnesses will be examined. And there are two other cases pending against him, i.e., FIR 168/2021 under Sections 148,149, 323, 341, 506 IPC, and FIR 203/2021 under Sections 147,149, 452, 506, 509 IPC, both registered at Police Station Raipur Rani, Panchkula. It is, however, not disputed that he has already been released on bail pending trial in both cases. The period of his custody is not disputed.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the totality of the aforementioned facts, and taking into account that trial of the case will take some time to conclude as none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined as yet, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose will be served by confining the petitioner to custody during trial.



CRM-M-16547-2025

-3-

7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

08.07.2025

Sima

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned *Yes/No*

Whether reportable *Yes/No*