



246

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

CRM-M-28514-2025

Date of Decision: 28.05.2025

MADAN LAL

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.195 dated 12.09.2024, registered under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 132, 220, 109, 351(1), 191(3), 190 BNS Section 25, 54, 59 Arms Act, Section 21 NDPS Act, Police Station Sadar, District Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in fact no such incident had taken place and the police had falsely implicated the petitioner. In fact a police party had entered the house of the petitioner on the pretext of searching of Munish Kumar, who was wanted in some FIR in Karnal. The police officials even extended threats to the petitioner and other relatives and while leaving, the police party had fired shots to intimidate the family members



of the petitioner. Even 57 grams of heroine was planted on Vijay Kumar, co-accused. Learned counsel has referred to the order Annexure P-3, whereby the concession of bail has been granted to Mohit Kumar @ Mohit Kumar Hira. He further contends that even co-accused, Vijay Kumar has been granted the concession of bail by this Court.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner is in custody since 12.09.2024 and challan has already been presented against him. Even no police official had suffered any injury in the present case and the trial has not been formally started against the petitioner. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

28.05.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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