



CRM-M-62366-2024

1

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

208

CRM-M-62366-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.03.2025

Taranjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU**Present:** Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.13 dated 21.02.2024 (P-1), under Sections 307, 323, 506, 160 and 148 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 201, 212, 216 and 120-B IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Division No.1, District Ludhiana.

2. Allegations are that petitioner along with co-accused formed an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of their common object inflicted injuries on the person of complainant party by firing gunshots and also criminally intimidated them with dire consequences of life.

3. Contends that petitioner was granted interim bail by the Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 12.12.2024 and in pursuance thereof, he



CRM-M-62366-2024

2

has already joined the investigation; hence, his custodial interrogation is not required.

4. The above factual position is not disputed by learned State Counsel, on instructions from ASI Dharmvir Singh.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

6. It transpires that petitioner was granted interim bail by the Coordinate Bench, vide order dated 12.12.2024 and the order reads as under:-

“1. Through the instant petition, as instituted under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S., 2023, the petitioner seeks the concession of pre-arrest bail, in case FIR No.13 dated 21.02.2024, under Sections 307, 323, 506, 160, 148, 149 of the IPC, and, Section 25 of the Arms Act (Sections 201, 212, 216 and 120-B of the IPC added subsequently), registered at P.S. Division No.01, District Ludhiana.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that, the petitioner has not been named in the FIR, rather his name has surfaced in the disclosure statement of his co-accused. Except the disclosure statement, the investigating agency is not seized of any other cogent inculpatory evidence, which could connect the petitioner with the alleged crime.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that, since many of the petitioner's co-accused have already been granted the relief of anticipatory and regular bail by this Court and by the learned Additional Sessions Judge concerned, as is evident from Annexures P-2 to P-4, therefore, since the petitioner is on a co-equal pedestal as his coaccused, he also deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion for 22.01.2025.

5. Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, D.A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State of Punjab.

6. In the meantime, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and to appear before the investigating agency, as and when called upon to do so. In the event of his arrest, he shall be admitted to interim bail on his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S., 2023.”

**CRM-M-62366-2024****3**

7. It is duly acknowledged by learned State Counsel that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, petitioner has joined investigation and his custodial interrogation is not required.

8. In view of the above, there is no justification to deny the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Consequently, present petition is allowed; interim order dated 12.12.2024 is made absolute subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482 of BNSS.

9. It is also made clear that petitioner shall fully co-operate with the Investigating Officer as and when called for further investigation.

10. The above observations be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case; rather confined only to decide the bail matter.

11. It is also clarified that in case of any recurrence on the part of petitioner, State would be at liberty to move an appropriate application for recalling of this order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

03.03.2025

Rajeev (rvs)

**(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes

Whether reportable No