



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

CRM-M-54588-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-7.8.2024

Jagjit Singh @ Jeeta ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate and
Mr. Harjot Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Siddharth Attri, AAG, Punjab,
assisted by SI Gurwinder Singh.

Ms. Arshdeep Kaur, Advocate for the complainant.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
21	19.3.2021	Hathur, District Ludhiana, Punjab	307, 341, 506, 34 of Indian Penal Code and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act

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 Sukhvir Kaur, wherein it is alleged that on 18.3.2021, the petitioner had fired at her and also at Amandeep Singh & Sukhwant Singh with an intention to kill them. It is alleged that while the complainant Sukhvir Kaur received firearm injuries on her hip, Amandeep Singh received firearm injury on his shoulder and fingers of left hand and Sukhwant Singh received injuries on his lip.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and that, in any case, since complainant



Sukhvir Kaur and injured Amandeep Singh have already been examined and the other injured Sukhwant Singh has been given, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose particularly when the petitioner has already been behind bars since the last more than 3 years and 2 months and conclusion of trial is likely to consume time.

4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel representing the complainant submitted that since the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and had inflicted injuries with firearm and also stands involved in other cases, no case for grant of bail is made out.
5. While learned State counsel submitted that as a matter of fact there were 5 FIRs out of which in 2 cases FIRs have been quashed and that as on date 2 cases are pending, learned counsel representing the petitioner has clarified that the petitioner already stands acquitted in 2 cases and the other 2 cases stand compromised and that as on date only 1 case pertaining to offence under Sections 406 and 498 of Indian Penal Code is pending. Learned State counsel informed that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last more than 3 years and 2 months and that as on date 3 PWs out of the cited 21 PWs have been examined.
6. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
7. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and also learned State counsel as well as learned counsel representing the complainant, this Court finds that the petitioner has been behind bars for a substantial period of more than 3 years and 2 months. The material witnesses i.e. complainant and also one of the injured have already been examined while the other injured has been



given up. Conclusion of trial is likely to consume time inasmuch as only 3 out of the cited 21 PWs have been examined so far. Under these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

8. 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.

7.8.2024
Pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

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