



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

CRM-M-9737-2025

Date of Decision: 03.03.2025

Paramjot Singh @ Paramvir Singh ...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Abdul Aziz, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Sparsh Chhiber, Advocate (through VC)
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No.71 dated 26.10.2023, registered under Sections 451, 323, 506, 34 of IPC (offence under Sections 452, 325, 324 of IPC added later on), at Police Station Sandaur, District Malerkotla.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR in the present case has been registered after a delay of about 10 days. As per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner was only present at the place of occurrence and he had allegedly caused injuries to Gurkamal Singh, injured. However, no specific injury has been attributed to him. He further contends that even the injury, which led to the addition of the offence under Section 325 IPC is attributed to Balraj Singh and the case of the petitioner is clearly



distinguishable from his case. He further contends that even the injured had suffered two injuries, which are attributed to the co-accused of the petitioner and the petitioner is deserved to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, as per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner had caused injuries to Gurkamal Singh, injured, but no specific role has been assigned to him. Moreover, in the considered opinion of the Court, the custody of the petitioner is not required in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.

6. Without commenting any further on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of BNSS. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C/482 (2) of BNSS.

03.03.2025
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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