

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

CRM-M-30364-2022

Date of decision: 15.12.2022

Vikram Singh alias Vicky alias Billa

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurlal Singh Dhillon, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rajesh Bhateja, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.96 dated 23.05.2022, registered at Police Station City Kotwali (Patiala), under Sections 307, 379-B, 323, 324, 341, 506, 336 and 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Status report dated 28.11.2022, by way of affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, City-I, District Patiala, filed in the Registry, is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the prosecution version, the petitioner while dancing in a marriage function, had fired a gun shot, which hit the structure (pipe) of music system (D.J.); that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner, and that the petitioner has been in custody since 22.05.2022. He further contends that

a compromise has been effected between the petitioner and the complainant, as would decipher from the compromise deed (Annexure P-3). So far as another case i.e. FIR No.79 dated 23.06.2010, under Sections 420, 167, 211 and 120-B, Police Station Julkan, registered against the petitioner, is concerned, he has been released on bail therein.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the grant of bail to the petitioner, submits that two licensed weapons alongwith live cartridges had been recovered from the petitioner. The petitioner while dancing in the marriage, had fired a gun-shot in the air, which might fatal for the persons present there.

However, learned counsel for the complainant does not dispute the factum of compromise effected between the parties.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

There are allegations against the petitioner that he started firing in the air and one of the splinters had hit the structure (pipe) of music system (D.J.). However, no injury has been attributed to him. Even otherwise, a compromise has been effected between the petitioner and the complainant.

The petitioner has been in custody since 22.05.2022. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Trial of the case would take time to conclude. As stated above, the petitioner has been released on bail in another case registered against him. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, 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 and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial
Court/Duty Magistrate.

15.12.2022

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No