

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH.**

**CRM-M-15127-2024**

**Date of Decision:-04.04.2024**

**Sunil Kumar.**

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

**State of Punjab.**

.....Respondent.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present:- Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Nishant Sehgal, Advocate for the Complainant.

\*\*\*

**JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)**

The Prayer in this petition under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail in case bearing G.D. No.005 dated 29.10.2023 under Sections 323, 324, 341, 307, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at P.S. Samrala, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana in case FIR No.233 dated 29.10.2023 under Sections 323, 324, 341, 307, 427, 506, 148, 149, 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at P.S. Samrala, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana.

2. The Counsel for the petitioner contends that initially the FIR had been registered at the instance of Satvir Singh under Sections under Sections 323, 324, 341, 307, 427, 506, 148, 149, 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act. Thereafter the cross version came to be registered at the instance of Manpreet Singh in which the petitioner is an accused. A compromise has been arrived at between the parties as is evident from the

affidavit Annexure P-4. The co-accused of the petitioner namely, Amandeep Singh, Manroj Singh and Kashish Khullar have already been granted the concession of bail. In fact 05 co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail in the case of version and cross version as was evident from Annexure P-3. As the petitioner was in custody since 24.11.2023 and none of the 15 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far, the trial of the present case was not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he was entitled to the concession of bail .

4. The learned State counsel on the other hand contends that the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner and his co-accused did not entitle him to the concession of bail. He however concedes that it is a case of version and cross version, that multiple accused have been granted the concession of bail either regular or anticipatory and that a compromise had been arrived at between the parties.

5. The Counsel for the complainant also admits the factum of compromise having been arrived at between the parties.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

7. The veracity of the prosecution case against the petitioner and his co-accused shall be adjudicated upon during the course of the Trial. Admittedly it is a case of version and cross version. A compromise has been arrived at between the parties. The petitioner is stated to be in custody since 24.11.2023 and none of the 15 prosecution witnesses had been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation the further incarceration of the petitioner is not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioner-Sunil Kumar son of Sh. Dalvir

Singh is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. The petition stands disposed of.

( JASJIT SINGH BEDI )  
JUDGE

April 04, 2024  
Vinay

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