

2024:PHHC:106835



284 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-31909-2024
Decided on:-20.08.2024

Raman BhanotPetitioner..
vs.
State of Punjab and anotherRespondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. R.P. Dhir, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Athar Ahmed, DAG, Punjab.
Ms. Ekta Thakur, Advocate with
Ms. Muskan Payyal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

1. By way of present second petition filed under Section 439 Cr.PC, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.272 dated 29.12.2023, registered under Sections 307, 341, 323, 506, 148,149, 120-B IPC and Section 25/27/54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Mahilpur, District Hoshiarpur, wherein the petitioner along with his co-accused has been implicated with the allegations of having fired shots upon the complainant with an intention to kill him; one bullet hit on his left shoulder, second bullet hit Inderjit Singh on his left upper body and third bullet hit Paramjit Singh @ Pamma near his left elbow.
2. On the other hand, the prayer has been vehemently opposed at the instance of learned State counsel while referring to the antecedents of the petitioner, who is stated to be involved in one more case under the

provisions of NDPS as well as Arms Act, besides, he having played active role in the incident in hand having fired shots upon the complainant, which hit him as well as two others.

3. 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.

4. In the present case, investigation stands concluded and the petitioner is in custody for the past more than 7 months; and so far even committal order has not been passed.

5. A perusal of record reveals that present is a case of version and cross-version and as such, the factum of aggressor is yet to be ascertained. In such circumstances, this Court does not find justification to extend the incarceration of the petitioner any further, especially, when learned counsel appearing on behalf of complainant-respondent No.2 admits that the keeping in view the future of the parties and generations to come, the parties have already entered into a settlement.

6. In view of the above, but without commenting upon merits of the present petition, the same is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds / surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

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

20.08.2024

sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:

Yes/No

Whether reportable:

Yes/ No