



CRM-M-29029-2024

-1-

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

**CRM-M-29029-2024**

Date of Decision: 16.10.2024

Devinderpal Singh @ Shinder

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Vishal Satija, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S.Arora, DAG, Punjab.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.225 dated 22.12.2023, under Sections 186, 353, 307 IPC and Sections 25/27/54-59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Sadar Commissionerate Jalandhar.

2. As per facts of the case, on 22.12.2023 the police party received a secret information that on 15.12.2023, by firing shots on the parked vehicle of agent Inderjeet Singh, by affixing a paper on his vehicle, ransom of Rs.5 crores was demanded by a member of Kaushal Choudhary Group. On receiving the information, the police party reached at the disclosed place and one person was seen coming on the motorcycle, who was given signal to stop. However, instead of stopping the motorcycle, he started firing from his weapon on the Inspector. In retaliation, the police party also fired, which hit the left leg of the person riding on the motorcycle. Firing made by the petitioner hit on the bullet proof jacket of Inspector Surinder Kumar. However, as the petitioner was hit on his left leg, he was apprehended, who disclosed his name as Davinderpal Singh @ Shinder (petitioner) and on checking, 03 live cartridges of 32 bore and 06 empties of 32 bore were recovered from the place of occurrence. FIR was registered and the



CRM-M-29029-2024

-2-

investigation commenced. The police party shifted the petitioner-injured to the hospital. The petitioner was arrested on 28.12.2023. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar praying for grant of regular bail, however, on hearing both the sides, learned Court declined the same vide order dated 22.05.2024. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in this case. He submits that the police party concocted a story of a fake encounter, in which rather the petitioner was injured. He submits that though the allegations in the FIR are that the petitioner fired on the police party, however, there is no injury on any member of the police party. It is submitted that though the petitioner has been prosecuted in four other cases, however, he is on bail in all those cases. He submits that from the facts and circumstances, it is apparent that the petitioner was falsely implicated in this case and now the investigation is complete and charges have been framed, however, despite that no prosecution witness has been examined by the prosecution only in order to prolong the incarceration of the petitioner. It is submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender. He submits that the petitioner intentionally fired at the police party, when he was signalled to stop and in retaliation the police party fired, which hit on the left leg of the petitioner. He submits that though the investigation



CRM-M-29029-2024

-3-

is complete, but out of total 28 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is apparent that as per the allegations made in the FIR, the petitioner was hit in the retaliatory firing made by the police party in the occurrence which took place on 22.12.2023. Though the petitioner has been prosecuted in four other cases, however, as submitted before this Court, he is on bail in those cases. The Investigation is complete and charges are framed. However, out of total 28 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**16.10.2024**  
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No