



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

CRM-M-3274-2025

Date of Decision: 24.01.2025

Amarjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. H.P.S. Bhunger, Advocate and
Mr. Vidul Kapoor, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting her regular bail in case FIR No.162 dated 03.11.2024 under Sections 109, 115(2), 190 and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Sadar Jagraon, Ludhiana.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Jugraj Singh @ Ladi. It was alleged by the complainant that he won Panchayat election unanimously. Due to the same, ex-Member Panchayat Sukhdev Singh and his accomplices i.e. Karnail Singh @ Raju, Amarjit Singh (petitioner), Binder Singh and Peeta Singh were nurturing grudge against him. On 01.11.2024 i.e. the day of Diwali festival, his nephew Manvir Singh had gone to the shop of Sucha Singh to purchase some crackers. However, he heard the cries of his nephew and found that Karnail Singh @ Raju, Amarjit Singh, Binder Singh, Peeta Singh, Paramjit Kaur, Harpal Kaur, Banso were giving fist blows to his nephew Manvir Singh. Karnail Singh then gave a stone blow on the face of Manvir Singh with intention to kill him. On raising alarm by him, they all ran away from there. They shifted his nephew to Civil Hospital, Jagraon, from where he was referred to Ludhiana. The petitioner was arrested on



08.11.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 08.01.2025. Hence, the petitioner approached this Court praying for grant of bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in this case. He submits that occurrence has been alleged to have taken place is in the night and there are bald allegations against the petitioner and co-accused that they gave fist blows to injured, Manvir Singh. He submits that similarly situated co-accused, namely, Sukhdev Singh, Gurpreet Singh, Harpal Kaur and Harbans Kaur have been granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court and co-accused Paramjit Kaur has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. He submits that the FIR has been lodged due to the rivalry in the Panchayat Election. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and thus, he deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner was the part of the unlawful assembly, who gave fist blow to the injured. He submits that the case is under investigation. He has placed on record the custody certificate.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 08.11.2024 and thus, he is behind bars from the last 02 months 12 days as on 23.01.2025. As stated by learned counsel for the petitioner, co-accused Sukhdev Singh, Gurpreet

Singh, Harpal Kaur and Harbans Kaur have been granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court and co-accused Paramjit Kaur has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. The petitioner has been alleged to have given fist blow to the injured. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

24.01.2025

sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No

Yes/No