

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

226

CRM-M-19156-2024

Date of decision : 25.04.2024

LOVEPREET SINGH @ LOVEJEET SINGH ...PETITIONER**Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS****...RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present : Mr. Nitin Narula, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sidharth Sandhu, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 and 3.

HARKESH MANUJA.J. (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C., prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0178 dated 24.09.2023 registered under Sections 307, 452, 148 and 149 of IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act at Police Station Lopoke District Amrisar Rural, wherein the petitioner has been implicated against the allegations of having given gun shot which hit on the calf of the right leg of the victim Lovepreet Singh @ Dadu.

2. The prayer made on behalf of the petitioner has been opposed by learned State counsel while submitting that the petitioner is involved in one more case bearing FIR No 323 dated 27.10.2020 under Sections 295-A, 298, 149, 153-A and 120-B of IPC and Section 66-A of Information Technology

Act, 2000 registered at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar Rural.

3. Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the complainant/injured Lovepreet Singh @ Dadu, submits that the parties are residents of the same locality and with the intervention of the respectables they have settled the dispute between them in order to maintain peace and harmony in the area.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book. I find substance in the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner.

5. Considering the fact that the investigation in the present case, already stands concluded with the filing of challan and trial is likely to take some time, besides it, the petitioner is already behind the bars for the last almost 05 months and taking note of the fact that the parties being residents of the same area have already settled their dispute with the intervention of respectables, I do not find any reason to extend the incarceration of the petitioner any further.

6. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing adequate bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. It is made clear that this order may not be construed as expression of an opinion on the merits of the case.

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

25.04.2024

monika

Whether speaking/reasoned ? Yes/No

Whether Reportable ? Yes/No