



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

114+325

CRM-M-8111-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 22.04.2025

KARANVEER SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. Santpal Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rajinder Singh Bhatta, DAG Punjab.
Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

CRM-13937-2025

For the reasons stated in the application, same is allowed.

Annexure P-7 is taken on record subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-M-8111-2025

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
46	09.06.2024	307, 324, 323, 341, 379-B, 148, 149 IPC; 25 and 27 of the Arms Act; [379-B IPC deleted and 379-B(2), 326, 325 IPC added later on vide rapat No.19 dated 06.08.2024’	Mallanwala, District Ferozepur



2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that even as per the allegations levelled in the FIR, although the petitioner was named therein but was not alleged to be carrying any weapon nor any injury is attributed to him. He contends that even there is no firearm injury in the alleged occurrence. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 17.12.2024 and challan has been presented in Court. He further submits that during the course of proceedings, with the intervention of respectables, a compromise has been effected between the parties vide Annexure P-7, whereby the complainant-victim has no objection in case the FIR is quashed. He further submits that the petitioner is a student, having no criminal antecedents, as such, prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail being involved in a heinous crime, hence, prayed for dismissal of the petition.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has admitted the factum of compromise (Annexure P-7) having been effected between the parties voluntarily and specifically stated that he has instructions from the complainant to state that he has no objection in case the petitioner is granted the concession of bail.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the allegation raised in the FIR, registered at the



instance of complainant Sukhjinder Singh, on 09.06.2024 at about 9/10 AM, while he was ploughing the land taken from Lakhwinder Singh then, Kulwinder Singh, Balwinder Singh, Sohan Singh and the petitioner came there and started hurling abuses and on arrival of Lakhwinder Singh to the spot, they went away. Later, while the complainant was going to his house, Kulwinder Singh, Balwinder Singh and Gurmeet Singh armed with 315 bore rifle, Sohan Singh and the petitioner along with 7-8 unidentified persons surrounded him and the nephew of the accused fired shot from 315 bore rifle and unidentified persons caused injuries to him. The assailants left the spot snatching his mobile phone and ₹28,000/-.

7. Admittedly, the name of the petitioner finds mentioned in the FIR, however, neither any specific overt act nor any firearm injury has been attributed to him. He is not even alleged to have been armed with any specific weapon in the FIR. The alleged injuries are attributed to unidentified persons. It is not disputed that during the course of proceedings, the complainant has effected compromise (Annexure P-7) and as per the instructions, learned counsel for the complainant has stated at the Bar pleading no objection in case of grant of bail to the petitioner, who is in custody since 17.12.2024 and has no criminal antecedents. Challan has already been presented in Court and the criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner, could only be determined after the conclusion of trial, which may take sufficient long time. In the circumstances, no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any longer.

8. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case,



the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Judge on Duty/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

- 9. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.
- 10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

22.04.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No