



319

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

CRM-M-14515-2025

Date of Decision:25.03.2025

AMANDEEP SINGH @ AMNA

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. Aminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepinder Singh Brar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.58 dated 07.08.2024, registered under Sections 109/115(2)/351(2)/191(3)/190 BNS (Section 238 BNS added later on) and Section 25 of Arms Act, Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur.
2. Reply by way of an affidavit of the Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Dhuri, District Sangrur has been filed on behalf of the respondent-State and the same is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it is a case of version and cross-version and the question of aggressor is yet to be adjudicated



during the course of trial. Even a cross-version in the shape of DDR bearing No.20 dated 09.08.2024 under Sections 126(2)/118(1)/115(2)/351(2)/351(3)-191/(3)/190/324(4) of BNS (and later on added 118(2) of NBS) registered at PS Sherpur, District Sangrur was also registered by the police against the present complainant side. He further refers to the photographs Annexures P-3 and CCTV footage from the camera near the place of occurrence. He further submits that the complainant party had caused injuries to the petitioner side and they caused injuries in their self defence. He further contends that four persons suffered injuries on each side in the present case. As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner was allegedly armed with iron rod and gave blow on the head of Harpreet Singh, injured. However, the said injury has been declared to be simple in nature. He further contends that the petitioner is in custody since 13.09.2024 and challan has been presented against him.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has 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.

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

6. In the present case, four persons had suffered injuries on each side and the trial Court is yet to examine the issue of aggressor in the present case. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last more than 06 months and challan has been presented against him. Moreover, the trial is not likely to conclude in near future.



7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

25.03.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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