

2025:PHHC:147599



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

CRM-M-58083-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 27.10.2025

Pronounced on : 30.10.2025

Paramjit Singh @ Pamma

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. L. S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The instant one is the second petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 263 dated 14.12.2023, registered under Sections 307, 224 and 511 of IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa. The previous petition was dismissed as withdrawn.

2. As per the allegations, on 14.12.2023, a police party headed by SI/SHO Bhupinderjit Singh was patrolling in the area of Police Station City Budhlada, when a telephonic information was received from SI Sukhjot Singh to the effect that the present petitioner, who was an accused in FIR No. 246 dated 27.11.2023, registered at Police Station City Budhlada, had fired shots at the police party at the time of his apprehension and recovery of weapon from him and in their defence, the police officials had also fired shots and the

2025:PHHC:147599



petitioner had sustained injuries and had been taken to Civil Hospital, Budhlada. On receipt of this information, a police party rushed towards the hospital and on reaching there, the statement of SI Sukhjit Singh was recorded, who disclosed that on the same day, they had apprehended the petitioner and two more accused namely Mangaljeet Singh @ Manga and Bhagwan Singh @ Bhana. After the police remand of both of them in case bearing FIR No. 246, they had proceeded for effecting recovery and on the demarcation of Bhagwan Singh @ Bhana, one .32 bore pistol along with magazine and 03 live cartridges were recovered, whereas the present petitioner suffered disclosure statement and in pursuance of the same, he led the police party to village Fuluwala Dod. On reaching there, he had taken out one .32 bore country made pistol from the shrubs in the bamboo plants on the inner side of the drain. However, instead of handing over the said pistol to the police officials, he had fired with the same towards them with intent to kill them and to flee. Keeping in view the gravity of the situation and to prevent the petitioner from escaping, shots were also fired by Constable Gurwinder Singh on the lower body parts of the petitioner, in which, he had sustained injuries. He was then overpowered and had been brought to the hospital. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was subsequently arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 02.03.2024. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is no more required as investigation stands completed and challan has been presented. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any

2025:PHHC:147599



useful purpose. There are no chances of his intimidating the witnesses, who are police officials. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a ground for denying him benefit of bail. No one was injured in the incident. Rather, it was him, who had sustained firearm injuries. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, it is argued by learned State counsel that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail as there are serious allegations against him since he had made attempt to kill the police officials on 14.12.2023, when he was getting recovery of a weapon effected in pursuance of his disclosure statement. He is a habitual offender since several other cases have been registered against him. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if released on bail. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by both the sides.

6. The petitioner, who was arrested in a case bearing FIR No. 246 dated 27.11.2023, is alleged to have fired shots with a .32 bore pistol on the police officials, when they had taken him to a place where the petitioner had kept concealed the said pistol. The petitioner had sustained firearm injuries in the same occurrence, which are stated to have caused to him in their self defence by the police officials. No police official had sustained any injury in the incident. The petitioner is in custody since 02.03.2024. The conclusion of trial would obviously take time as out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined so far. He was in custody in some other case

2025:PHHC:147599



even at the time of occurrence. It is well settled proposition of law that involvement of an accused in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon ***Maulana Mohammad Amir Rashadi vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***, wherein it was observed by Hon’ble Supreme Court that merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of an accused for grant of bail cannot be rejected. In view thereof, in the considered opinion of this Court, the continued detention of the petitioner would not serve any fruitful purpose. Keeping in view the period spent by the petitioner in custody and the above discussed facts and circumstances, a case is made out for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

30.10.2025

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No