



260

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

CRM-M-31344-2025

Date of Decision:21.07.2025

KARANDEEP KALIA

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

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

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

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

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the 2nd petition under Section 439 Cr.P.C.with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.93 dated 26.06.2022, registered under Sections 307/148/149/506/120-B IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Division No.3 District Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner had allegedly fired two shots from the weapon, which was allegedly held by him. However, no fire arm was recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that in the present case Kartik, injured had suffered injuries and as per the medical record (Annexure P-4), he has already been discharged from the hospital. Learned counsel further submits that the matter has been amicably resolved between the parties. Even a petition for quashing of the FIR, on the basis of the compromise was referred before this



Court, but the same was withdrawn from this Court. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 28.06.2022 and is in custody for the last more than 03 years and 01 month. Even the prosecution has not been able to examine even a single witness so far.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that 03 more FIRs under the provisions of NDPS Act have been registered 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, Kartik, son of the complainant had suffered injuries and injured has already been discharged from the hospital. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last more than 03 years and 01 month and no witness has been examined so far. Thus, there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial in near future. Moreover the parties have compromised the matter and the chances of conviction of the petitioner are bleak. 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.

21.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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