



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

207

CRM-M-14703-2026
Date of decision: 18.05.2026

JASHANPREET SINGHPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

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

Present: - Mr. Malkiat S. Hundal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant **second 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. 118 dated 07.08.2025, registered under Section(s) 109, 351(2), 3(5), 115(2), 238 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Patti, District Tarn Taran after the earlier petition was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 09.02.2026.
2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the FIR has been registered on the complaint of one Rohan to the effect that he was going to market along with his friends and while on way, the petitioner alongwith other co-accused, who were armed with *datar* and

pistol, came on a motorcycle, which was being driven by the petitioner. The petitioner stopped the motorcycle whereupon the other co-accused fired a shot and followed it up with *datar* blow upon the complainant. Counsel for the petitioner contends that apart from a *Lalkara*, there is no other attribution against the petitioner and that he has not caused any injury to any person. He submits that the petitioner is a young boy, aged 20 years and he is in custody since 07.08.2025. Only 01 witness out of 20 witnesses has been examined so far and even the said witness did not support the case of the prosecution. He contends that the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 09 months and further incarceration of the petitioner is not likely to serve any purpose.

3. Learned State Counsel does not dispute that the petitioner is attributed only a *lalkara* and having accompanied the other co-accused. The gun shot injuries as well as the *datar* blow injuries are attributed to the other co-accused. The period of custody as well as stage of trial are also not disputed. He, however, contends that there was one other case under Section 318(2) of BNS that had been registered against the petitioner. He, however, does not dispute that Abhishek Sharma who appeared as PW-1 has not supported the case of the prosecution.

4. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations against the petitioner, the stage of trial, the period of custody already undergone, the young age as well as the fact that PW-1 has not supported the case of the prosecution, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.

MAY 18, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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