



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

236

CRM-M No.28636 of 2025
Date of Decision: 04.09.2025

Satmol Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Lovish Rattan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
83	30.07.2024	Majitha Road, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar	109, 126(2), 191(3), 190, 118(1), 117(2) and 118(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) and 25 of Arms Act, 1959

2. As per the allegations, on 30.07.2024, the complainant Akashdeep Singh was going towards his house in his car along with his friends Krishna and Ajay. When they reached near Taj Mental Hospital, they were intercepted by the petitioner who stopped the car of the

2025:PHHC:120565



complainant and made an exhortation to teach a lesson to the complainant for assaulting his brother Anmol and ousting him from bus stand. Then the accused Harjit Singh who was armed with a sword, accused Anmol armed with a datar, the petitioner having pistol and three unknown persons who were also armed with weapons, dragged the complainant out of his car. The petitioner fired a shot with a pistol thereby hitting his elbow of left arm. The complainant fell down. Another shot was fired on the wrist of the complainant by the petitioner. Accused Harjit Singh struck blows with sword on the head and left hip joint of the complainant. He was also assaulted by the unknown persons. His friends raised rescue alarm and then all the assailants fled from the spot. The cause of grudge was that some days prior to the incident, a verbal altercation had taken place between the accused Anmol and the complainant. After registration of FIR of this case, investigation proceedings were initiated. The injured Akashdeep Singh was medically examined. The accused Harjit Singh was arrested on the same day. He suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and also took the names of the petitioner and co-accused. He got recovered the sword used by him in commission of the subject offences. The petitioner was also arrested on 11.08.2024. Recovery of weapon of offence was made from him. Investigation stands completed and challan stands presented in the Court.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The FIR of this case is a counter blast to the complaint submitted by his father against the members of the

2025:PHHC:120565



complainant party as he had been assaulted by them. The injuries allegedly sustained by the complainant are self inflicted. The co-accused Anmol and Harjit Singh have been extended benefit of bail. He too deserves to be extended the same benefit. The injuries allegedly sustained by the victim have not been opined to be firearm injuries and are shown to be incised/lacerated wounds. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody any more. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. He is involved in two more criminal cases. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The complainant is alleged to have sustained firearm injuries at the hands of the petitioner and some simple as well as grievous injuries at the hands of the co-accused. He is in custody since 11.08.2024. There is no medical opinion as to the injuries being sustained by the victim being dangerous to life or either of them was a firearm injury. The trial is likely to take time. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Keeping in view the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case lest they prejudice the trial, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves to be released on bail at this stage.

2025:PHHC:120565



Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

04.09.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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