

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

**CRM-M-35281-2021 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: 07.03.2022**

Karambir Sandhu @ Gurpreet Goppi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL**

Present:- Mr. Manvinder Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Gill, 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 at Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar, under Sections 307, 148, 149, 202, 120-B and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959.

Custody certificate by way of affidavit dated 05.03.2022 of the Additional Superintendent, Central Jail, Kapurthala, submitted by the learned State counsel is taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially, the petitioner and other co-accused were not named by the complainant; that in his supplementary statement recorded on 05.09.2020, the complainant named Rajandeep Singh @ Raja and Parminder Singh @ Pinda along with the petitioner; that there is no specific attribution to the petitioner; that even the

injuries were on the non-vital part of the body and the petitioner has been in custody since 05.09.2020.

He further submits that Kanwarjit Singh @ Kammu, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 19.08.2021, the petitioner was involved in two other FIRs, after his arrest in the present case.

On the other hand, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender with criminal antecedents, inasmuch as, two more FIRs i.e. FIR No.208 dated 24.07.2020, under Sections 307, 379-B(2), 341, 34 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, Police Station Shahkot, District Jalandhar and FIR No.202 dated 25.07.2020, under Section 188 IPC, Police Station Sadar, Jalandhar, are registered and/or pending against the petitioner. He, however, does not dispute the custody period of the petitioner. He further submits that the prosecution evidence is yet to be commenced.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner has been in custody since 05.09.2020. The injuries attributed to the petitioner are on non-vital part. The prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined, therefore, the conclusion of the trial would take a long time. Hence, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

In view of the above, without commenting anything on the merits, lest it should prejudice the case of either side, the petition is allowed

and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)  
JUDGE

07.03.2022  
Mangal Singh

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