

2025:PHHC:119696



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

**CRM-M No.34475 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 03.09.2025  
Reserved on: 21.08.2025**

Avtar Singh @ Vicky

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Robindeep Singh Bhullar, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

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

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J.**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.05 dated 08.01.2025 registered under Sections 109, 126(2), 3(5) and 317(2) (added later on) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station IT City, District SAS Nagar.

2. As per the allegations, on the intervening night of 07/08.01.2025, the complainant Ekamdeep Singh, along with his friend Inderpal Singh, was going from Patiala to Chandigarh in his Etios make car. While on the way, they stopped at a grocery shop at Banaur to purchase something. Three youths, who were riding on a black-coloured

2025:PHHC:119696



Splendor motorbike, had come to them and had a conversation with them for a while. When the complainant and his friend left the shop, those youths started following the complainant on their bike and after some distance, they gave a signal to stop their vehicle. Out of fear, the complainant increased the speed of his car and took a turn towards the airport chowk. However, those youths managed to overtake his vehicle and intercepted him by stopping their bike in front of his car. Thereafter, one of them alighted from the motorbike. He took out a pistol from his waistband and fired a shot with the same towards the complainant with an intention to kill him. The shot hit the left shoulder of Inderpal Singh. The assailant fired 3-4 more shots, one of which hit the back of the complainant. One of those youths made an exhortation to kill the complainant and his companion. However, to save his life, he sped away with his car. Both of them were got admitted in the hospital. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, the petitioner along with Amarveer Singh and Anmol Singh was nominated as accused. The petitioner and co-accused Amarveer Singh were arrested on 15.01.2025. One .32 bore pistol, five live cartridges and a car of Brezza make was recovered at his instance. On 18.01.2025 also, he got recovered one pistol of .32 bore, four live cartridges, a countrymade pistol of .315 bore and live cartridges.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has been in custody since 15.01.2025. A false recovery has been planted upon the petitioner. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore,

2025:PHHC:119696



urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. *Per contra*, it is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, that there are serious allegations against the petitioner who, along with the co-accused, made an attempt to commit murder of the complainant and his friend by firing shots with pistol. Multiple injuries had been sustained by the complainant and his friend. The petitioner is a habitual offender as several other cases of similar nature have been registered against him. There are chances of his committing similar offences, intimidating the witnesses, or absconding, if extended benefit of will. Therefore, it is argued that the petitioner does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner, along with the co-accused, is alleged to have made attempt to commit murder of the complainant and his friend by firing shots with pistol upon them. Both the victims had sustained firearm injuries, which are obviously dangerous to life. The petitioner has criminal antecedents since, as per the custody certificate, he has been involved in four other cases of similar nature. He has not been extended benefit of bail in either of these cases. Apprehension expressed by the State that the petitioner may intimidate the witnesses, abscond or committing similar offences cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. Keeping in view the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail, his antecedents, and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case,

2025:PHHC:119696



but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits of the case, lest they prejudice the trial, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

03.09.2025  
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No