

2023:PHHC:122011

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

**CRM-M-45285-2023
Date of Decision:15.09.2023**

Hardeep Singh @ Harmandeep Singh @ Ghulla ...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 Cr.PC with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No. 88 dated 08.05.2023 registered under Sections 307/341/506/148 and 149 of IPC and under Section 25/27 of Arms Act, Police Station Chheharta, Amritsar (Annexure P-1).

2. As per the case of the prosecution, at about 09:00 P.M on 08.05.2023, when the complainant was working in the rice sheller, he received a phone call from his son Prince, that he was coming back to his house. However, on the way, Amandeep Sharma and Hardeep Singh stopped him and started abusing him and caused him injuries. At about 10:00 PM, Amandeep Sharma, Hardeep Singh and Raju along with unidentified persons came outside his house on motorcycles and scooters. Amandeep Singh fired a shot, which hit on his left thigh and Hardeep Singh fired a shot, which hit on the shoulder of Sania, neighbour. Several persons gathered at the spot and the accused fled

away from the spot with their respective weapons. Learned counsel further contends that the matter has been compromised between the parties and a compromise deed (Annexure P-2) has already been signed by both the parties. He further contends that similarly placed co-accused Amandeep Sharma has been granted the concession of bail vide the order dated 18.08.2023 (Annexure P-3). The challan has already been presented in the present case and the Trial Court proceedings may take quite a considerable time.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner has been specifically named in the present case and the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and with their able assistance, I have gone through the Court record carefully.

5. It is not in dispute that the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties and a compromise deed (Annexure P-2) has been executed between the parties. Still further, the injured has been discharged from the hospital and the investigation has already been completed and further custody of the petitioner will serve no meaningful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

15.09.2023
hitesh

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