



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-9556-2025
Decided on : 10.09.2025

Ladla . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ankit Kharbanda, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ladla	34	23.03.2022	307, 353, 186, 506, 34 of IPC, 1860 and 25 of the Arms Act, 1959	Kathu Nangal	Amritsar Rural

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner was a wanted accused in case FIR No.20, dated 11.01.2022, under Sections 392, 342, 506, 34 IPC and Sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station B Division, Amritsar. When the police team had gone to arrest him, he along with another accused tried to escape by running away. It is further alleged that the petitioner threatened the members of the police party not to come forward or chase them. During this process, one of the co-accused,



after taking out a country-made pistol from his pocket (*dabb*), fired at the police party.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in the said incident, none of the police officials sustained any injury from the firing. On the contrary, it was the petitioner's co-accused, namely Princedeeep Singh @ Prince, who sustained an injury on the upper backside of his left thigh, due to a firing shot made by the members of the police party. It is, therefore, argued that the prosecution story is concocted and has been prepared by the police themselves to justify their firing upon the co-accused, which resulted in his injury.

It is further submitted that the petitioner has remained in custody for about 2 years and 11 months. Out of a total of 18 prosecution witnesses, only 6 have been examined so far, and the conclusion of the trial is not likely in the near future. Thus, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, the learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 09.09.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner has been previously involved in a number of criminal cases. The details of such cases, as mentioned in the custody certificate, are noticed below in tabulated form: -



<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Registered FIR/Case</i>	<i>Present Status of the FIR/Case</i>
1.	<i>FIR No.81, Dated 18.04.2021, U/S 379/411 IPC, P.S. A Division</i>	<i>Pending trial</i>
2.	<i>FIR No.20, Dated 11.01.2022, U/S 392/342/506/34 IPC, 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act, P.S. B. Division</i>	<i>Pending trial</i>
3.	<i>FIR No.291, Dated 23.11.2020, U/S 379 IPC, P.S. Airport</i>	<i>Sentence period is already completed on 18.03.2025</i>
4.	<i>FIR No.47, Dated 11.03.2022, U/S 302 IPC, 25/54/59 of Arms Act, P.S. Gate Hakima</i>	<i>Acquitted, after remaining inside jail for 01 year, 09 months and 15 days.</i>

Thus, learned State counsel submits that, keeping in view the antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve any leniency and prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Taking note of the aforesaid facts, the status of other cases noticed here-above, and also considering the total incarceration period undergone by the petitioner in the present case, i.e., about 2 years, 10 months, and 29 days as on 09.09.2025, I deem it appropriate to consider the prayer for bail, more particularly, because the petitioner is a young person aged about 27 years and, except in one case, i.e., FIR No.291 dated 23.11.2020 (in which he has already completed his sentence), he is not shown to have been convicted in any other case.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an



expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 10, 2025
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*