



227

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

**CRM-M-17470-2025
Date of Decision:04.04.2025**

AMRITPAL SINGH

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. H.P. Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Aminder Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case DDR No.20 dated 09.08.2024 (Annexure P-2) under Sections 126(2), 118(1), 115(2), 351(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190, 324(4) BNS, 2023 (Sections 118(1) & 118(2) added later on) registered at Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur in FIR No.58 dated 07.08.2024, registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 351(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS & 25 of Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur..

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in fact the FIR in the present case was initially registered on the basis of the statement made by



the present petitioner. He further contends that as a counterblast to the Annexure P-1, a cross version in the shape of GD No.20 dated 09.08.2024 was registered against the present petitioner and others. As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner had caused injuries with a small *Kirpan* on the right elbow of Amarjit Singh @ Ladi, which is on non-vital part of the body. It has been further alleged that later, the petitioner had given a brick blow and had caused an injury on the right thumb of Harinderpreet Singh. Except that, no other role has been assigned to the petitioner. Apart from that, the petitioner had also suffered two gun-shot injuries and is a case of version and cross-version. He further submits that the question of aggressor is yet to be decided by the trial Court during the course of trial. The petitioner was wrongly arrested in the present case on 24.12.2024 and challan has already been presented against him.

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 the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last more than 03 months. After completion of investigation, the challan has already been presented against the petitioner and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

6. 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.

04.04.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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