



**THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

106

CRM-M-294-2025

Date of decision: January 9th, 2025

Narinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Ranjodh Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.119 dated 28.08.2024 under Sections 109, 125, 351(2), 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Kapurthala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in question was registered against three unidentified persons, who on the fateful day, after coming to the house of the complainant, fired towards his gate. Learned counsel contends that no suspicion was raised qua the involvement of the petitioner in the alleged occurrence, coupled with the fact that the petitioner would have had no motive also to participate in the said occurrence. It has been submitted that in the aforementioned facts and circumstances, more so when it is a case of no injury, the petitioner deserves to be extended the concession of bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. H.S. Deol, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab,
accepts notice on behalf of the State.

5. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. He, on instructions, submits that although the petitioner has not been named in the FIR in question, however, it had surfaced during investigation that the petitioner, who is a man of previous criminal antecedents, had been hired to carry out the crime in question at the instance of co-accused Gurwinder Singh, with whom the complainant had an ongoing monetary dispute. Learned State counsel has also brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner was on bail in the other previously instituted cases when he yet again participated in the present occurrence.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

7. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. The instant petition stands dismissed.

9. 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.

January 9th, 2025

Puneet

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No