



CRM-M-13146-2024

-1-

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

CRM-M-13146-2024  
Decided on : 31.07.2024

Arshdeep Singh ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ..... Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present : Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)**

1. This is the petition filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case DDR No.30 dated 08.01.2024 under Sections 307, 323, 324, 160, 148, 149 IPC, Sections 25, 27, 54 and 59 of Arms Act (Sections 212, 216, 120-B, 201 IPC added later on) in case FIR No.132 dated 13.11.2023 under Sections 302, 307, 160, 323, 324, 148 and 149 IPC (Sections 212, 216, 120-B, 473 IPC and 25, 27, 54 and 59 of Arms Act were added later on) registered at Police Station D-Division Police Commissionerate Amritsar District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated his submissions made on the previous date of hearing that it was a case of version and cross-version wherein injuries were admittedly



received by both the sides. Learned counsel has submitted that no specific role much less injury has been attributed to the petitioner other than his presence having been shown along with a sword at the time of alleged occurrence. Learned counsel has further submitted that since the petitioner is a Nihang, it was natural for him to be carrying the sword in his person. Learned counsel has still further submitted that after the petitioner was arrested in the cross version case on 13.11.2023, the investigation had concluded and even challan presented, however, since 37 prosecution witnesses have been cited, there is no likelihood of the trial concluding in the near future.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, has not disputed that it is a case of version and cross-version, and no specific role, much less injury, has been attributed to the petitioner in the crime in question. However, learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner was part of an unlawful assembly and had been named as an accused at the first instance itself. Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Mohit Kumar, has not disputed the stage of trial.

On a pointed query put to the State counsel, he has not controverted the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.



CRM-M-13146-2024

-3-

5. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, since no specific role much less injury has been attributed to the petitioner in the crime in question, which prima facie, comes across as a sudden clash between two groups, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

6. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

31.07.2024  
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

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