



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

CRM-M No.3099 of 2025
Date of decision: 24th January, 2025

Mukha Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Ashok Giri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh, Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of BNSS in case FIR No.140 dated 04.11.2023 under Sections 458, 323, 324, 148, 149, 382, 427, 459, 325, 326, 307 of the IPC registered at Police Station Dera Baba Nanak, District Gurdaspur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been argued that no grievous injury has been attributed to the petitioner in connection with the alleged occurred. Instead, only a single simple injury has been attributed to the petitioner. Furthermore, it is submitted by the learned counsel that the petitioner has been in custody since 11.11.2024. The charges against him were framed on 18.12.2024, yet none of the 17 prosecution witnesses have been examined to date, indicating that the trial is unlikely to conclude in the near future. Additionally, it has been

brought to the notice of this Court that similarly placed co-accused has already been granted concession of anticipatory bail.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, on instructions, has reiterated the allegations against the petitioner, asserting that he was part of an unlawful assembly that attacked the complainant and his family. However, the State, on instructions, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner, nor has it been disputed that the prosecution evidence has yet to commence despite the charges being framed. It is also not disputed that only simple injuries have been attributed to the petitioner. On a pointed query, learned State counsel, on instructions, has acknowledged that similarly placed co-accused has been granted anticipatory bail and that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

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

5. In the facts and circumstances, as enumerated hereinabove, this Court thus deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner. The petition as such is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate. 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.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

January 24, 2025
rps

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