



CRM-M-27386-2025

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

**CRM-M-27386-2025
Date of decision: 07.07.2025**

SURAJ**...PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA****...RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present: Mr. Abhinav Sood, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S.GREWAL,J. (ORAL)

1. This is a petition for anticipatory bail filed under Section 482 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.0061 dated 22.04.2025 under Sections 109(1), 3(5), 351(2) of BNS and 25(1-B) (a) of Arms Act registered at Police Station Gurgaon City, District Gurugram.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner fired a gunshot with an intention to kill which hit the complainant's right hand. However, he missed the shot because the complainant moved aside. The complainant has suffered a firearm injury on his right wrist.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present FIR is a counter blast to the FIR No. 0224 dated 20.10.2023 which was got registered by the petitioner against the brother of the complainant. He further submits that the petitioner has been implicated in a false case due to personal grudges and previous enmity.
4. Notice of motion.
5. Mr. Prashant Sethi, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of the complainant. He has filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant



CRM-M-27386-2025

and the same is taken on record. He has opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that an earlier litigation can also be construed to be counter productive both ways and it cannot be assumed that the present case is a fraudulent one.

6. Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He has opposed the prayer for concession of bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had played an active role in the commission of the crime. He further submits that the incident was captured in the CCTV camera installed in the vicinity of the crime scene wherein the petitioner and the co-accused are seen firing shots at the complainant.

7. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and gone through the record.

8. Keeping in view the facts of the case, the present petitioner had a motive for causing injuries to the complainant, therefore, no ground has been made out for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

07.07.2025

renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No