

218

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

CRM-M-14359-2024

Date of Decision: 01.04.2024

Amritpal Singh @ Neeshu @
Amarpal

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Davinder Singh Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. with a prayer to grant regular bail in case FIR No.164 dated 11.08.2023 registered under Sections 379-B(2), 34 of IPC and offence under Section 201 of IPC added later on, at Police Station Ajnala, Amritsar Rural, District Amritsar.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Darshan Singh son of Gurdeep Singh. As per him, at about 6.30 p.m. on 11.08.2023, he and his brother Sukhdev Singh were present in the market at a distance of about 500 meters from their house. In the meantime, his son Navjinder Singh came on a motorcycle to buy some goods from the market and while they were looking at him, three young men came from the side of Ajnala on a motorcycle and attacked his son with a datar. The injury was caused on his head with a datar and he fell down from the motorcycle and his

mobile phone also fell from his pocket. When the accused started running towards Amritsar side, their motorcycle slipped and fell on the road and suffered injuries. Two of the accused were caught by the public at the spot and their names were Amritpal Singh @ Neeshu and Sunny Singh. The name of the third person was disclosed as Akash son of Jagga. With these broad allegations, the FIR in the present case was ordered to be registered by the police.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case by the complainant, by coining a false version. He further contends that no recovery from the petitioner was effected in the present case and the complainant or his son had not suffered any injury in the present case. Even the prosecution has not collected any medical evidence in this regard. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 11.08.2023 and is in custody since then. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented against the present petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. However, he admits that there is no other case against the petitioner and the complainant and his son, namely, Navjinder Singh were not taken to the hospital.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 11.08.2023 and is in custody for the last more than 07 months. The final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has already been presented before the Court and no purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars.

7. 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.

01.04.2024.
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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