



**107+249+333 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of decision:08.05.2025

(i) CRM-M-18549-2025(O&M)

Gurpreet Singh ...Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

(ii) CRM-M-23496-2025

Balkaran Singh ...Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

(iii) CRM-M-23500-2025

Harmandeep Singh ...Petitioner

VS.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Advocate with
Mr. Yogit Mehta, Advocate and
Mr. Devyansh, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Dharminder Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J.(oral)

1. This order shall dispose off above-said three petitions i.e.
CRM-M-18549-2025, titled as Gurpreet Singh Vs. State of Punjab, CRM-M-



23496-2025 titled as Balkaran Singh Vs. State of Punjab and CRM-M-23500-2025 titled as Harmandeep Singh Vs. State of Punjab, whereby the petitioners have prayed for grant of regular bail to them in case FIR No.213 dated 20.11.2024 registered under Sections 109, 191(3), 61(2), 351(2) of BNS, at Police Station Division No.5, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Rahul Sadhiora son of Jarnail Singh with regard to the injuries allegedly caused by the petitioners to Vaneet Arora. However, Vaneet Arora and the complainant have entered into a compromise with the petitioners and have also executed a compromise deed dated 26.04.2025 in this regard. Moreover, Vaneet Arora, injured has already been discharged from the hospital. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioners were ordered to be arrested by the police on 20.11.2024 and are in custody for the last about 05 months. The challan has been presented against them and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future.

3. On the other hand, status report by way of an affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police (Civil Lines), Ludhiana has been filed by learned State counsel in Court today and the same is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioners and they do not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submits that he has no objection, in case the present petitions are ordered to be allowed by this Court.

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



carefully.

6. In the present case, admittedly, the petitioners are in custody for the last about 05 months and the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties. Even Vaneet Arora and the complainant have executed a compromise deed dated 26.04.2025 and have stated that they have no objection in case the petitions are allowed by this Court.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

8. Pending applications, if any, stand also disposed of.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

08.05.2025
hemlata

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