



In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-22513-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 20.08.2024

Kunal Mahajan @ Keshav ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Inderjeet Singh Ladher, DAG, Punjab.

FIR NO.	DATE	POLICE STATION	OFFENCES
118	22.05.2023	Maqboolpura, Amritsar	307/34 IPC and Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act (Sections 336, 212, 216, 411, 120-B IPC added later on)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

- The instant petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in respect of aforementioned FIR.
- The FIR in question was lodged at the instance of Ravneet Singh @ Sonu, wherein it is alleged that on 21.05.2023, he along with his



friends had gone to Hotel Green Wood near Golden Gate, Amritsar to have dinner and that when they were returning back, a white coloured car stopped near them in which there were 3/4 un-identified persons and out of them two who were carrying pistols alighted from the said car and fired at them with an intention to kill them. The complainant and his friends, however, fled away from the spot so as to save themselves. The complainant's friends namely Pradeep Singh and Satnam Singh, who were carrying their licensed weapons, also fired 5-6 shots in the air to scare away the assailants.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is nowhere named in the FIR and came to be nominated pursuant to a disclosure statement made by Param Dalip Singh @ Pamma. It has been submitted that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last 1 year 2 months and 17 days and that as on date none out of the cited 21 PWs has been examined.
4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel has submitted that having regard to the nature of allegations and the fact that co-accused Param Dalip Singh @ Pamma in his disclosure statement has disclosed his name, his complicity is clearly evident. It has however, been informed that the petitioner has been behind bars since the last 1 year, 2 months and 17 days and that out of cited 21 PWs, none has been examined till date.



5. This Court has considered the rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Without commenting anything as regards the merits of the case, but having regard to the long custody and also the fact that none of the PW has been examined till date necessarily indicating that conclusion of trial is likely to consume time, further detention of petitioner will not be justified. The petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

20.08.2024
mohan

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No