



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

271

CRM-M-24840-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 28.05.2025

DALJEET SINGH ALIAS DILJIT SINGH

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. K.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Durgesh Garg, AAG Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

- 1. Short reply dated 27.05.2025 filed in the form of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, (City), District Ferozepur, is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.
- 2. Arguments heard.
- 3. The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
344	03.09.2024	103, 109, 351(2), 190, 191(3), 61(2) BNS; 25(6) and 25(7) of the Arms Act	City Ferozepur, District Ferozepur

- 4. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner



that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case only on the allegation of hatching a criminal conspiracy and doing recce of the place of occurrence. He contends that no specific overt act has been attributed to the petitioner nor is he involved in any other case. He submits that after the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court, but no witness has been examined by the prosecution and the trial is moving at a snail's pace. Thus, prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the short reply filed by the State has opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of offence. He submits that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail and prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the case of prosecution, the allegation against the petitioner, in the present case, is of being part of the conspiracy and conducting the recce in the area, however, no specific overt act or injury has been attributed to the petitioner in the alleged occurrence. There is no other criminal case registered against the petitioner. After the arrest of the petitioner on 06.09.2024, challan has been presented in the Court and out of 45 witnesses cited by the prosecution, none has been examined till date.

7. Therefore, considering the clean antecedents of the petitioner and all the facts and circumstances of the case, coupled with the slow pace with which the trial is moving, no purpose would be served by detaining the



petitioner in custody any longer. Moreover, the criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner, could only be determined after the conclusion of trial, which may take sufficient long time.

8. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Judge on Duty/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

9. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

28.05.2025
S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No