

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

215

CRM-M-21984-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 19.09.2022

RAJANDEEP SINGH @ RAJA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. MS Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. IPS Sabharwal, DAG Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case bearing FIR No.245 dated 20.08.2020, registered under Sections 307, 148, 149, 202 and 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on the basis of the supplementary statement of the complainant, the petitioner has been indicted in the present case; that the petitioner has been in custody since 05.09.2020 and that co-accused, namely, Karambir Sandhu @ Gurpreet Goppi, has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court on 07.03.2022. He further submits that complainant-Dilpreet Bawa was recalled for further examination on 13.07.2022, (through video conferencing) and he has stated that the petitioner and Kanwarjit Singh, have neither committed any offence with him nor inflicted any injury on his person. Thus, the complainant has not supported the prosecution version.

Per contra, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He, however, submits that the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged occurrence, inasmuch as, he along with the co-accused have fired four bullets on the person of the complainant and that, as per the report of the Doctor, one bullet is still in the right knee of the complainant. He further submits that out of total 30 prosecution witnesses, two have already been examined.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 05.09.2020. Complainant, in his cross-examination, conducted on 13.07.2022 has specifically stated that the petitioner has not committed any offence and has not inflicted any injury on his person. Co-accused has already been enlarged on bail. Most of the prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. In such circumstances, the trial of the case would take a long time to conclude. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, 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 learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

19.09.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

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