



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.231

CRM-M-13003-2026
Date of Decision: .09.04.2026

MONU

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Ankit Kharbanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 0281 dated 23.12.2024, registered under Sections 109, 125, 194(2), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (earlier Sections 307, 336, 160, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860) and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Sadar Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the prosecution is that it is a case of free fight between two groups wherein both the parties allegedly inflicted injuries upon each other. As per the allegations in the FIR, the present petitioner along with the other co-accused persons formed an unlawful assembly and attacked the complainant party by firing gunshots and by throwing glass bottles and brickbats. The specific role attributed to the present petitioner is that he allegedly fired two gunshots from a pistol at the



complainant with an intention to kill him. However, it is a matter of record that no gunshot injury has been received by any member of the complainant party. It has further come on record that a cross-version in the form of DDR has also been registered against the opposite party under the same sections including Section 307 IPC, wherein the allegations are that the present petitioner himself received serious injuries on his head and face caused by a Kirpan during the occurrence. It has also been mentioned in the DDR that the petitioner suffered a serious injury to his eye, resulting in damage to the same, and he remained admitted in the hospital for treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present case is one of version and cross-version, and the cross-version also stands registered vide DDR No. 21 dated 25.12.2024 under Sections 109, 125, 194(2), 191(3) and 190 of the BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act. It is further submitted that co-accused Sonu has already been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 07.11.2025. It is argued that the case of the petitioner Monu stands on a better footing, as no injury has been attributed to him. The only allegation against him is that he fired two shots from his pistol, however, no firearm injury has been caused to any person from the opposite party. The other allegations are that he threw glass bottles and brick bats at the complainant party. It is further submitted that, rather, the petitioner Monu has himself suffered injuries on his face and head in the cross-case.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail by submitting that the allegations against the petitioner as well as the co-accused are serious in nature and that the petitioner has been attributed the



role of firing gunshots during the occurrence, therefore he does not deserve the concession of bail at this stage.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this Court is of the considered view that the present petition deserves to be allowed. It is not disputed that the present case is one of version and cross-version, indicating that both the parties were involved in the occurrence. It has also come on record that the present petitioner himself suffered serious injuries on his head, face and eye, as reflected in the DDR lodged against the opposite party, and he remained admitted in the hospital for several days. Although the allegation against the petitioner is that he fired gunshots at the complainant, it is noteworthy that no gunshot injury has been received by any member of the complainant party.

6. This Court also finds that co-accused Sonu, who is the real brother of the present petitioner and was also stated to be present at the spot and to have participated in the occurrence, has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail. Similarly, another co-accused Deepak alias Deepu, who was also allegedly present at the spot, has been granted regular bail. Thus, the case of the present petitioner is not distinguishable from that of the aforesaid co-accused.

7. Furthermore, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about four months and 17 days and the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. Keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the nature of the occurrence being a case of free fight, the existence of version and cross-version, the injuries suffered by the petitioner, the fact that no gunshot injury has been received by the

complainant party, and the principle of parity with the co-accused who have already been granted bail, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing the requisite bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. However, it is clarified that nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

10. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

09.04.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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