



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

237

CRM-M No.47086 of 2024
Date of Decision: 25.09.2024

Pritpal Singh @ Preeta ... Petitioner
Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
66	18.06.2024	Arniwala, District Fazilka	307, 323, 324, 336, 160, 148 and 149 of IPC and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959

2. Adumbrated facts as emanating from the record are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a statement recorded by ASI Mohinder Singh alleging therein that on the same day at about 12 PM, when he was performing patrolling duty in the area of Dhani Ram Dakhi village Chahlawali, a secret information was received that the present petitioner armed with pistol and co-accused who were also armed with weapons, along with 4-5 unidentified persons, who had created

2024:PHHC:128427



nuisance in the area of Mandi Arniwala, were riding on their vehicles. They were following Gurpreet Singh son of Gurmeet Singh resident of Mohammed Amira and Gurpreet Singh son of Joginder Singh resident of Kabulshah Khubban and were present on the link road leading from Village Chahlawali to Ghattianwali Jattan, with an intention to kill the above named two persons while firing in the air. Believing the secret information to be true, FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 03.08.2024. The petitioner moved an application for grant of regular bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fazilka vide order dated 28.08.2024.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was named in the FIR on the basis of some secret information. Infact, he was not at all present at the spot. But neither any injury has been attributed to him nor any recovery has been effected from him. Nineteen of the accused whose case is on similar footing have been extended benefit of anticipatory bail. Some co-accused have been extended benefit of regular bail. His custodial interrogation is no more required. Investigation and trial are likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any more. Hence, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel who has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter, has submitted that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. The petitioner has criminal antecedents.

Therefore, it is urged by him that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

2024:PHHC:128427



5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel at considerable length and have gone through the record.
6. As per the allegations, the petitioner along with the co-accused formed membership of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object of such an unlawful assembly, fire with weapon was raised in the air. Injuries were also caused to the members of the opposite party. The petitioner is in custody since 03.08.2024. His custodial interrogation is no more required. He was nominated as an accused on the basis of some secret information. No specific overt act has been attributed to him. His involvement in two other cases cannot be considered to be a ground for denying benefit of bail to him. It is well settled proposition of law that the bail is the rule and jail is an exception. His further detention in custody is not going to serve any useful purpose especially in the circumstance when most of the co-accused have been extended benefit of anticipatory/regular bail. On the ground of parity, the petitioner too deserves to be extended the same benefit. In view of these facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

25.09.2024
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No