



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-6240-2025

Date of decision: 07.02.2025

JAGROOP SINGH @ JASROOP SINGH @ ROOPI

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Sonpreet S. Brar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail by way of present second petition under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 in case FIR No.167 dated 14.11.2023 under Sections 307, 323, 506, 148, 149 & 427 IPC (Section 325 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Doraha, District Khanna.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that perusal of the FIR reveals that although the petitioner has been named therein and alleged to be armed with baseball bat, however, no specific injury or role has been attributed to him. Instead it was co-accused Gursimran Singh, Jaspreet Singh, Pardeep Singh etc., who had been attributed injuries on the persons of the complainant party including the



injury inviting the mischief of Section 427 IPC. Learned counsel contends that since the charges have been framed, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose as none of the twenty two witnesses have been examined so far.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel opposite, has not disputed that the petitioner has been in custody since 18.11.2023 and after the challan was presented, charges have also been framed. It has also not been disputed, on instructions, that none of the twenty two prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. On pointed query put to the learned State counsel, as to whether the petitioner has been attributed any specific injury on the person of the complainant, he on instructions, has replied in the negative but has reiterated that the petitioner was named in the FIR in question and was armed with a baseball bat at the relevant time.

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

5. The possibility of the trial concluding in the near future looks remote as none of the twenty two prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. The petitioner, even as per the admitted case of the prosecution, has not been attributed any specific injury.

6. In the facts and circumstances enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner as no further incarceration is required.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and 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.

**February 07, 2025**  
*Nisha Yadav*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

|                                   |               |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether reasoned/speaking?</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether reportable?</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |