



223

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

CRM-M-176-2025**Date of Decision: 15.01.2025**

Paramjit Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Sumit Dua, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepinder Singh Brar, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate (through VC)
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.175 dated 16.08.2024, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 118(2), 110, 191(3), 190 of BNS (added later on Section 109 of BNS) at Police Station Division No.6, Jalandhar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR nor he had any concern with the alleged incident. He further contends that the petitioner was named as an accused in the present case by his co-accused, while they were in police custody and except the said evidence, there was no illegally admissible evidence against him. He further contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case as he is related to the other persons, who have been arrayed as an accused. Even as per



the case of the prosecution, the petitioner was simply stated to be present at the place of occurrence and had not caused any injury to the injured in the present case. Learned counsel further contends that two co-accused, namely, Manjeet Singh @ Manjit Singh @ Lovely and Gagandeep Singh alias Milkha were arrested by the police and they have already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide orders (Annexures P-5 and P-6 respectively). He further contends that the injured has already been discharged in the present case and his custodial interrogation may not be required at this stage.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of crime and the injured, namely, Madan Gopal Bagha had suffered eight serious injuries on his person. Even injury No.2 has been declared to be dangerous to life. However, it is admitted fact that the said injury has not attributed to the present petitioner.

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

5. Even though, the petitioner has claimed that he had not present at the place of occurrence, but the learned State counsel submits that the petitioner was present along with other assailants. Thus, the veracity of the allegations levelled by the prosecution witnesses is yet to be adjudicated by the trial Court only during the course of trial.

6. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of the BNSS. It

will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

15.01.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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