



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

303

CRM-M-41589-2025

Date of decision: 17th September, 2025

Harminder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Dr. Puneet Kaur Sekhon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Munish Dev Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The instant one is the second petition 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. 58 dated 10.04.2025 registered under Sections 109, 281, 125(a), 125(b) and 324(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Mullanpur, District SAS Nagar. His previous petition had been dismissed as withdrawn.

2. As per the allegations, on 08.04.2025, the complainant along with his cousin Priyanshu Sharma had gone to watch cricket match at village Tira. At around 8:30 PM, while both of them on their way to back their house and had reached near liquor vend of village Toga, suddenly a car driven at a high speed came from the opposite direction, the driver thereof



while driving his vehicle in a rash and negligent manner, rammed his vehicle into the Acura vehicle of the complainant due to which Priyanshu had fallen on the ground and his head struck against the divider, whereas, the head of the complainant struck against the front windshield of the car. He gave signal to the driver of the car to stop but with intent to kill the complainant, the driver of the car reversed the same and by accelerating the speed of the vehicle dragged the complainant with his vehicle to a distance of about 15 meter. His right leg was seriously injured. Thereafter, the car stopped after a distance. The vehicle of complainant was completely damaged. The car driver who was under the influence of liquor was apprehended by the public persons and he disclosed his name as Harminder Singh i.e. the petitioner. The complainant and his cousin were taken to hospital and were provided treatment. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on the same day and has been in custody since then. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of two days in lodging of the FIR which has not been satisfactorily explained. The ingredients for commission of offence punishable under Section 109 of BNS are not attracted. The complainant is a politically influential person and has levelled false allegations against him. At best, it was a case of accidental collision and for monetary gain, it is made a case for attempt to murder. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery remains to be effected from him. There is no independent witness to corroborate the prosecution version. The petitioner



has clean antecedents. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have made an attempt to kill the complainant on 08.04.2025 by driving his vehicle rashly, negligently and at a high speed and hitting the same with the vehicle of the complainant. He is further alleged to have dragged the complainant and his vehicle along with his car up to a distance of 15 meters resulting in causing several injuries to the complainant. He was under influence of liquor at that time as per the medical examination report. The complainant has sustained injuries. However, there is nothing on record to suggest that either of such injuries was declared to be dangerous to life. The investigation stands concluded. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. Keeping in view the period spent by the petitioner in custody, his clean antecedents coupled with the fact that trial is likely to take time, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.



7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

17th September, 2025
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |