



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

256

CRM-M-17010-2025
Date of decision: 29.07.2025

HARPREET SINGH @ RAJA BRAR

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL**Present:-** Mr. Abhaysher Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.39 dated 18.05.2024 under Sections 307, 324, 323, 427, 148, 149 of IPC, 1860 (Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 added later on vide GD No.12 dated 09.08.2024) registered at Police Station City Zira, District Ferozepur.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused has entered into a Hospital where the complainant had gone to visit his relative and the present petitioner has given a *kapa* blow on the person of the petitioner and the injured witness. In the present case, there is no injury attributed to the petitioner which is stated to be dangerous to life. However, grievous injury has been attributed to the petitioner who is stated to have given kapa blow on the left hand of the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter has now been compromised with all the injured witnesses namely Tanish, Sukhdeep Singh @ Rhythm and Ritik Chopra (Annexure P-3). He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 10.06.2024 and has undergone custody period of



more than 01 year, 01 month and 15 days.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Whereas Mr. Aman Mittal, Advocate has put in appearance by way of filing *vakalatnama* on behalf of the injured witnesses and states that he has no objection in case the petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail.

6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing of custody certificate dated 28.07.2025 and reply of even date filed on behalf of the respondent-State and further states that the petitioner has undergone custody period of 01 year, 01 month and 15 days. He further states that charges in the present case are yet to be framed.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is 01 year, 01 month and 15 days and also the fact that the matter has since been compromised with the injured witnesses and moreover, charges are yet to be framed, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice and also conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate



concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

29th July, 2025
Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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