



CRM-M-53289-2024

-1-

**235 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**CRM-M-53289-2024
Decided on : 02.12.2024

Dharampreet Singh @ Preet

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAULPresent : Mr. T.S.Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

1. This is the petition filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No.101 dated 27.08.2024 under Sections 109, 125, 324(4), 351(2), 191(3) and 190 of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station City Rampura District Bathinda.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 28.08.2024 pursuant to a secret information allegedly received by the police that there had been some altercation between groups on account of their previous enmity leading to cross-firing between them. It has been submitted that other than this, no specific allegation has been levelled against the petitioner of inflicting any fire arm injury on the person of anyone



CRM-M-53289-2024

-2-

from the opposite side. Learned counsel has further submitted that the investigation in the present case is complete as challan stands presented; furthermore, the only fire arm injury on the foot of one Chamkaur Singh from the opposite side, has been attributed in the occurrence in question to a co-accused and furthermore, it is a matter of record that subsequent to the registration of the FIR in question, the parties have ironed out their differences and arrived at an amicable settlement.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has neither disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor has it been disputed that the investigation in the present case is complete and challan stands presented. On further instructions, it has not been disputed that there are no specific allegations levelled against the petitioner in the FIR in question much less pertaining to the injury allegedly sustained by the complainant party.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 28.08.2024. The investigation in the case in hand is complete as challan stands presented. The trial has not progressed further as charges are yet to be framed.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove coupled with the fact that there are no specific allegations against the



CRM-M-53289-2024

-3-

petitioner in the occurrence in question or any injury attributed to the petitioner, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

02.12.2024
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No