



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

CRM-M-40595-2025

Date of Decision:08.08.2025

Sukhdev Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Gurmeet Singh Saini, 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 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in DDR No. 33, dated 19.04.2025, under Sections 109,191(3), 190 of B.N.S and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, Police Station Zira @ Sadar Zira, District Ferozepur in cross case FIR No.42, dated 19.04.2025, under Sections 109,191(3),190 of B.N.S and Sections 25,27 of Arms Act, Police Station Zira @ Sadar Zira, District Ferozepur.

2. A status report by way of an affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Zira, District Ferozepur has been filed on behalf of respondent-State and the same is taken on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner was allegedly armed with *Kirpan and* neither any role has been assigned to him nor he had caused any injury to anyone. As per prosecution case, Satnam Singh took the rifle from his father and fired a

gunshot at the complainant. However, the said injury has also been declared to be simple in nature. Learned counsel next contends that on the basis of the statement made by Jugraj Singh, co-accused another FIR No. 42, dated 19.04.2025, under Sections 109,191(3),190 of B.N.S and Section 25 and 27 of Arms Act, Police Station Zira @ Sadar Zira, District Ferozepur has been registered against complainant party. Thus, it is apparent that the complainant side was the real aggressor and the petitioner has been wrongly named by the complainant. He further contends that even the FIR was got registered by the complainant after unexplained delay of three days and this time was utilised for coining a false version.

4. 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 petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

6. As per the case of the prosecution, the petitioner was simply present at the place of occurrence. Even, the fire arm injury, which is attributed to Satnam Singh has been declared to be simple in nature. Moreover, it is a case of version and cross-version and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required, at this stage.

7. Thus, without commenting any further, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Sections 482 (2) of B.N.S.S. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join the investigation, if so required,

by issuing a written notice in this regard and she shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

08.08.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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