



CRM-M-49650-2025

-1-

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

204

CRM-M-49650-2025

Date of Decision: 11.09.2025

Judgejeet Singh alias Judge

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Jain, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Satjot Singh Chahal, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (Oral)

The petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR no.46 dated 27.04.2022, registered under Sections 307, 34 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Urban Estate, District Patiala.

2. As per allegations in the FIR, the petitioner, while driving his car, fired three-four bullets with a pistol at the complainant Jasdeep Singh, who was in another vehicle with two more persons including Mandeep Singh. He is stated to have hit the complainant's arm, and some other thing had also pierced in the shoulder of his friend Mandeep Singh who was sitting on his adjoining conductor seat.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that eight persons were named in the FIR, out of whom six have not been nominated as accused. It shows version of the complainant is not trustworthy. Besides, as per the MLR, there is no firearm injury on the person of the complainant, and his accomplice Mandeep Singh has an abrasion on right side of chest which is stated to be a firearm injury. Besides, he has been in custody since 23.12.2024, and

challan/chargesheet has been presented in the Court on 20.03.2025. Charge has not been framed. Trial is not progressing for various reasons including non-production of the petitioner from jail by the concerned authorities. He also contends that co-accused Jaskaran Singh *alias* Soni has been granted pre-arrest bail by this Court, vide order dated 12.09.2022, passed in CRM-M-26320-2022.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the facts aforementioned including the petitioner's custody as also the injuries statedly suffered by the complainant and his accomplice. He, however, submits that efforts will be made to conclude the trial and examine the prosecution witnesses who are thirty-one in number.

5. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances, it is apparent that trial of the case will take some time to conclude as charge has not been framed as yet. Investigation is complete, and no useful purpose will be served by confining the petitioner to custody any longer. Besides, there is no apprehension of his threatening the witnesses or tampering with the evidence.

6. Accordingly, petition is allowed, and the petitioner is directed to be released on regular bail subject to satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, provided his custody is not required in any other case.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

11.09.2025
Payal/Maninder

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No