



CRM-M-18883-2025

-1-

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

105

CRM-M-18883-2025

Date of decision : 13.05.2026

SUNIL KUMAR ALIAS BABA

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Arshdeep Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in FIR No.245 dated 21.11.2024 under Sections 109, 132, 221 and 111 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 25 (6, 7 and 8) of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station City Moga, District Moga.

2. The case of the prosecution is that while the petitioner was being taken by the police officials of CIA Staff, Moga from Dehradun for the purpose of effecting recovery of a pistol in connection with another FIR, he allegedly entered a room, rushed to pick up the concealed pistol and opened fire at the police officials. It is alleged that in retaliation, the police cross-fired at the petitioner, which hit on his foot above the knee.

**CRM-M-18883-2025****-2-**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that the prosecution story is wholly concocted. It is submitted that the timeline relating to the injury allegedly suffered by the petitioner and the version put forth by the prosecution does not match. Learned counsel further submits that as per the prosecution story, the occurrence took place at 08:15 AM on 21.11.2024, whereas the FIR came to be registered only at 12:10 PM. It is further submitted that a perusal of the Medico-Legal Report of the petitioner reflects the time of arrival at the hospital along with the police as 08:05 AM on 21.11.2024, with the history of gunshot firing recorded as 07:40 AM, which creates a doubt regarding the prosecution version. Learned counsel also submits that the petitioner is in custody since 21.11.2024 and therefore, deserves the concession of regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, upon instructions, vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail and submits that the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature, involving an attack on police officials with a firearm. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in as many as 23 other criminal cases.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature, as he is accused of having opened fire upon police officials while in police custody during the course of recovery proceedings. Moreover, the petitioner is stated to be a habitual offence and is involved in 23 more cases.

**CRM-M-18883-2025****-3-**

8. Keeping in view the gravity of the offence, the role attributed to the petitioner and his involvement in several other cases, this Court is not inclined to grant regular bail to the petitioner at this stage.

9. Consequently, the petition is, hereby, dismissed.

10. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to move a fresh application for bail in case the trial does not make substantial progress.

May 13, 2026
A.Kaundal

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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