



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

224

CRM-M-63733-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 18.11.2025

Diwan Singh alias Rajan

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present : Mr. Rahi Mehra, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Jasjit Singh, DAG Punjab

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.115 dated 27.06.2025, registered under Sections 308(4), 351(1), 351(3), 109 and 111 of BNS & 25, 27 of Arms Act at Police Station Bhikhiwind, Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for more than 4 months. Initially the FIR was registered against unknown persons, however, in the 3<sup>rd</sup> supplementary statement of the complainant, he has been named and the one who had allegedly fired at the house of the complainant. There is a delay of 2 days in lodging the FIR. It is a no injury case. No recovery has been effected from the petitioner. There is no evidence to connect him with the alleged incident. Challan was presented on 26.09.2025, however, charges have not been framed and in all there are 13 prosecution witnesses. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

3. The custody certificate dated 17.11.2025, filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 4



months and 12 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations levelled by the complainant in the supplementary statement of having fired at her house. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage and the petitioner not being involved in any other case.

5. Heard.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 4 months and 12 days; not involved in any other case; challan stands presented on 26.09.2025, however, charges are yet to be framed and there are a total of 13 prosecution witnesses, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer

or tamper with the evidence in any manner.

- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

8. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

9. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)  
JUDGE

18.11.2025  
M.Kamra

|                           |   |          |
|---------------------------|---|----------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes / No |