



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

226

CRM-M-898-2025

Date of decision: 23rd July, 2025

Vansh @ Princepal

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 132 dated 15.07.2024 registered under Sections 109 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Tarn Taran.

2. As per the allegations, on the night of 13.07.2024, the complainant Chamkaur Singh was present at a religious place of his village and was lending a helping hand in the fair organized therein. He received a call from his family members at about 11.30 pm and when he came at the chowk for attending that call, he saw the petitioner standing there along with the co-accused. Upon seeing him, the co-accused Nanak Singh made an exhortation that the complainant should be killed with a gunshot and on this, his son i.e. the present petitioner took out his pistol and fired a shot with the



same, thereby hitting the back side of his left leg. Clamour being raised by him attracted other persons and then the assailants, who were three in number fled from the spot on a motorbike. He was taken to hospital and had sustained injuries. The motive as attributed to the petitioner was that about one and half year back, the brother of the complainant had solemnized love marriage with a girl in the family of the petitioner. On the statement of the injured-complainant, FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 08-08-2024. He suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. The co-accused Nanak Singh @ Laddi was also arrested. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of 2 days in lodging of the FIR which has created a doubt over the credibility of the prosecution version. He has been in custody since 08-08-2024. No recovery has been effected from him. He was in custody in some other case at the time of his arrest. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. He is a habitual offender, being involved in three more cases of serious nature. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar



offences, if extended, benefit of bail. Therefore, it is, urged that the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have fired a gunshot upon the complainant, thereby causing a firearm injury on his left leg. As per the medico legal report, the injuries so received was caused by pellets, the same have not been opined to be serious in nature. He is in custody since 08-08-2024. No prosecution witness has been examined so far. He is involved in three more cases, but is stated to be on bail in those cases. Trial will take time to conclude. His involvement in other cases cannot be a ground for denying benefit of bail to the petitioner. It is a well-settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

23rd July, 2025
Parveen Sharma



CRM-M-898-2025

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |