



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

216

**CRM-M-34351-2025
Date of decision: 25.08.2025**

MEHAKPREET SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No. 19 dated 20.02.2025 under Sections 109, 191(3), 191, 190, 351(2), 333 and 238 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Fatehgarh Churian, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been arraigned as an accused in the aforesaid case that was registered on the statement of Lovejot Singh son of Jatinder Singh. He contends that in the initial version, the petitioner was not named as an accused but has been roped in as an accused after recording of the

**CRM-M-34351-2025**

-2-

supplementary statement of the complainant recorded on 22.04.2025 i.e. after nearly five days of the incident in question. He further submits that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner and offence under Section 109 of the BNS, 2023 has been attracted on account of the fire arm injury on thigh attributed to co-accused Kewal and Ravi Karan. He has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 23.04.2025 and no recovery of any nature has been effected from him.

3. Counsel for the respondent-State, however, contends that the petitioner had participated in the commission of the offence alongwith the co-accused. He is, however, not in a position to dispute that the petitioner is in custody since 23.04.2025 and that the investigation is already completed but the charge has not been framed so far. He is also not in a position to dispute that the petitioner is not required in any other criminal case.

4. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

5. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, the period of custody, the absence of recovery as well as the age of the petitioner, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.



CRM-M-34351-2025

-3-

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.
8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

AUGUST 25, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No