



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

245

CRM-M-250-2025

Date of decision: 14.01.2025

Jasbir Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Raj Kumar Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.85 dated 04.07.2024 under Sections 324, 323, 148, 149 of the IPC (Section 326 of the IPC added lateron) registered at Police Station Chattiwind, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the instant case is a case of version and cross version wherein both the parties received injuries at the hands of each other. It has been further contended that even as per the allegations levelled in the FIR which has been annexed as Annexure P-1, the petitioner was alleged to be armed with a datar with which he inflicted a grievous injury on the right arm of the complainant. Learned counsel has submitted that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents and has now been in custody since 26.10.2024; furthermore, investigation in the present case is complete



CRM-M-250-2025

as challan has already been presented, hence, further incarceration of the petitioner in the case at hand, would serve no useful purpose moreso when charges are yet to be framed coupled with the fact that as many as 11 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions from ASI Tarsem Singh, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor has he disputed that the investigation is complete in the present case and challan already stands presented. Learned State counsel on further instructions has also not disputed that it is a case of version and cross version and the petitioner has been attributed a datar injury on the right arm of the complainant which was opined to be grievous in nature.

4. On a pointed query put to the learned State counsel as to whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, he, on instructions, has categorically replied in the negative.

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

6. As not disputed by the learned State counsel, the present case is a case of version and cross version; the petitioner has been attributed a datar injury on the non-vital part of the body of the complainant, which is a grievous injury on his right arm. The trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

**CRM-M-250-2025**

7. 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. 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.

8. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

14.01.2025

Vinay

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE**

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