

2025:PHHC:174227



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

103+205

CRM-M-57198-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.12.2025

DILPREET SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. R.P. Dhir, Advocate and
Ms. Simsi Dhir Malhotra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-50304-2025

The present application has been filed for placing on record the
copy of judgment dated 30.08.2025 as Annexure P-11.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant-petitioner
does not press the instant application.

Dismissed as not pressed.

CRM-40904-2025

Application is allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-57198-2025

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 94 dated 22.07.2017, registered under Section(s) 307 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25/27/30/54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur.

2. A perusal of the case file reveals that FIR No. 94 dated 22.07.2017, registered under Sections 307 and 34 of the IPC and Sections 25, 27, 30, 54, 59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Chabbewal, was lodged on the statement of the complainant, Pritam Singh, against Dilpreet Singh (petitioner herein) and co-accused Joga Singh. As per the complainant, Dilpreet Singh arrived at the spot armed with a gun and was raising lalkaras and that co-accused Joga Singh instigated his son- Dilpreet Singh, to “teach a lesson” to the complainant for taking possession of the disputed land and directed him to fire at the complainant and kill him. Acting upon this exhortation, Dilpreet Singh fired at Bhupinder Singh, the complainant’s son, with the intention to kill him. The pellets from the gunshot struck the victim on his head, face and other parts of his body, causing injuries and resulting in his collapse. When the complainant attempted to intervene to save his son, Dilpreet Singh fired another shot at him; however, the complainant managed to sit down and the bullet passed over his head. Thereafter, Dilpreet Singh

fired additional shots in the air, causing people to gather at the spot, whereupon the accused fled with their weapons.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has remained in custody since 25.10.2024, thereby undergoing actual custody of more than 12 months. It is submitted that the charge has not yet been framed and that as many as 34 witnesses, including prosecution witnesses and those pertaining to the cross-case, are yet to be examined. Thus, the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude. He contends that Pritam Singh, husband of Satnam Kaur is the complainant in the present case. The dispute arose with respect to possession of the property. He contends that, as per the enquiry report, Satnam Kaur was not in possession of the land in question at the time of the occurrence, rather, the complainant side had themselves conspired to take forcible possession of the land with the assistance of certain gangsters, which led to a confrontation between the parties, during which injuries were sustained. It is further argued that the injuries suffered in the incident were the result of a mutual fight and not of any act done with any intention to kill. Counsel further submits that, in the absence of any allegation or material to show that the petitioner caused injuries with an intent to cause death, the invocation of Section 307 IPC is clearly unwarranted.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-State, on the other hand, submits that the FIR in the present case was registered in the year 2017 and immediately thereafter the petitioner absconded and fled to Dubai. He was declared a proclaimed offender in September 2017. It is only in October 2024 that he was arrested. Thus, the petitioner remained beyond the reach of law

for nearly seven years, wilfully evading the legal process. Counsel contends that in view of these circumstances, the petitioner poses a clear flight risk and, therefore, is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-State is, however, not in a position to dispute that arguable issues would arise for consideration with respect to the conflicting and contested rights inter se between the parties over the property forming the subject matter of the dispute. It is also not disputed that the petitioner has already undergone actual custody of around 12 months in the present case and that even the charge has not yet been framed. He also does not dispute that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

6. Having heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration that there are arguable issues and line of defence that would accrue in favour of the petitioner and taking into consideration the period of actual custody already undergone; the stage of the proceedings wherein even the trial is yet to commence and the petitioner's clean antecedents, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

DECEMBER 12, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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