



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

CRM-M-42602-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 5.9.2024

Ranveer Singh ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. G.P.S. Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Prabhdeep Singh Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
517	28.12.2023	Sohana, SAS Nagar, Punjab	307, 323, 325, 341, 34 of IPC

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of the aforementioned FIR.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Sandeep Kaur, wherein it is alleged that on 27.12.2023, when she and her son were present near Shree Guru Harkrishan Hospital and she had gone to take tea being offered at ‘langar’, she saw that 3-4 boys had encircled her son and were abusing him and were threatening to kill him. It is alleged that one of the boy namely Rana, who was carrying a brick gave a blow with the same on the head of complainant’s son with an intention to kill him and as a result of which, he fell down. After causing said injuries, the assailants fled away from the spot.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that in any case even if all the allegations



levelled in the FIR are taken to be correct, no case for offence under Section 307 IPC can be said to be made out inasmuch as it is a case where the petitioner was not carrying any weapon but is alleged to be carrying a brick and is alleged to have given a solitary blow only.

- 4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submitted that since a blow with great force had been inflicted by the petitioner on the head of the injured, his intention to kill the victim is clearly evident. It has been submitted that the injury resulted in fracture of skull and as such his complicity is clearly evident. Learned State counsel has informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 8 months and that the case is yet to be committed.
- 5. This Court has considered rival submission addressed before this Court.
- 6. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel, this Court finds that in the given circumstances, it will be debatable as to whether the offence attracted would be under Section 307 or under Section 308 of Indian Penal Code. In any case, since the petitioner has been behind bars for a substantial period of about 8 months and the trial has not even commenced till date, further detention of the petitioner would not be justified.
- 7. The instant 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.

5.9.2024
Geeta/P

Whether speaking /reasoned
Whether Reportable

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge
Yes / No
Yes / No