



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

219

CRM-M-28076-2024

Date of decision: 25.09.2025

Sandeep Singh @ Sonu

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Arpan Sabharwal, Advocate for
Mr. Brijesh Nandan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vrishketu, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.164 dated 14.07.2023 under Sections 307 of the IPC registered at Police Station Division No.5, District Commissionerate of Police Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been attributed a single blow on the neck of the complainant with a *khanda*, which was opined to be dangerous to life by the doctor. It has been contended that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents and the occurrence in question took place at the spur of the moment. Learned counsel further submits that after the registration of the FIR in question, the parties have, with the

intervention of the well-wishers and respectables, amicably settled the dispute and ironed out their differences in which regard a compromise has also been effected. Learned counsel has also submitted that the parties would be shortly approaching this Court for quashing of the FIR in question on the basis of compromise which was effected on 29.11.2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, therefore, prays that in the aforementioned facts and circumstances, the petitioner be enlarged on bail as he has now been in custody since 02 years 02 months and 09 days; investigation is complete as challan stands presented and charges framed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, on instructions, has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner nor has the stage of trial been disputed. Learned State counsel, on instructions, submits that as many as 20 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution and the prosecution evidence is likely to commence from 14.10.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has not controverted the submissions made by the counsel opposite qua only a single blow having been inflicted upon the complainant by the petitioner. It has also not been disputed that the parties have ironed out all their differences and decided to put a lid over the dispute in which regard they would be approaching this Court for quashing of the FIR in question on the basis of compromise. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that in view of the compromise effected, he does not oppose the prayer made

by learned counsel for the petitioner enlarging the petitioner on bail.

6. Learned counsel for the State, on being pointedly queried as to whether the petitioner has any previous criminal antecedents, he, on instructions, has replied in the negative.

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

8. The petitioner has been in custody for more than 02 years. The prosecution evidence is likely to commence only on 14.10.2025. The parties have arrived at an amicable settlement and the complainant has no objection on the petitioner being enlarged on bail. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

25.09.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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