



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-21068-2026
Date of decision: 24.04.2026

DAVID @ DAVED @ RAJAPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

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

Present: - Mr. Manpreet Singh Dua, Advocate and
Mr. Shamsheer Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant first 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. 157 dated 28.07.2024, registered under Section(s) 109, 307, 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 (Section 111 of BNS added later on) and Section 25, 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station, Dasuya, Hoshiarpur.
2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Amritpal Singh son of Kulwant Singh, translated version of which reads thus:-

"I am running a flour mill near my house and also a Grocery

shop on the Ground Floor of my house where we reside in a joint family. Today at around 8.30 pm I was coming towards my house after closing the flour mill and when I entered my grocery shop, my younger brother Balwinder Singh and his wife Harpreet Kaur were sitting inside, then three young boys with muffled face entered into the shop where my Brother Balwinder Singh and sister-in-law raised alarm and when I turned back then one of the person attacked upon me with Datar which hit on my head but I got saved because of wearing a turban at that time then I immediately turned back. In the mean time second person gave Datar blow with intention to kill me, I raised my left arm and the blow hit on my wrist whereas I was trying to hold Datar from the other hand. In the mean time my sister-in-law started throwing the articles lying in the shop towards the above said three persons. The third person who was armed with pistol, fired from his pistol and the bullet hit my left thigh and we raised alarm then all the three persons ran away whereas one another person who was their companion had already started the motorcycle and was standing outside. Thereafter all the four persons while trying to ran away from the spot on the motorcycle towards Dasuya, they fired two more gun shots and started running. One person could not sit on the motorcycle in a hurry. One of the boy sitting on the motorcycle shouted that Abhi hurry up and sit on the motorcycle and another shouted Rehampuriah hurry up where the fourth person ran and sat on the motorcycle and these four people rode on the motorcycle and went towards Dasuya. These four boys have entered our shop with intention of looting and inflicted injuries with Gun shot to me.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the only allegation against the petitioner is to the effect that he conducted a recee and thus has been nominated as an accused for being part of the criminal conspiracy. It is submitted that the co-accused Ajay Kumar,

Rajdip @ Raja and Arunpreet Singh have already been granted concession

of regular bail vide order dated 27.03.2025 in CRM-M-15805 of 2025; order dated 05.05.2025 in CRM-M-22640-2025 and on dated 12.05.2025 passed in CRM-M-24597-2025 respectively. He further contends that the petitioner is in custody since 28.09.2024 and out of 24 witnesses only 02 witnesses have been examined while 01 has been given up, hence, 21 witnesses remain to be examined. He contends that the case of the petitioner is on a better footing as compared to co-accused Rajdeep Singh @ Raja who was also attributed to have fired a gun shot.

4. Learned State Counsel is not in a position to dispute the same.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the present case and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, the period of custody already undergone, the stage of the trial as well as the fact that other co-accused to whom a graver role had been attributed have already been granted concession of regular bail, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

APRIL 24, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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