

2026:PHHC:079925



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

255

CRM M-27283-2026

Date of Decision: 19.05.2026

Pritpal Singh @ Jatta

...Petitioner (s)

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Sanpreet Singh Kalra, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, with a prayer to grant him regular bail in case FIR No.149 dated 23.09.2025 under Sections 109, 304(1), 118(1), 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS 2023 (earlier Sections 307, 379, 324, 506 and 34 I.P.C) registered at Police Station Doraha, District Ludhiana (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the case set up by the prosecution, the petitioner along with his co-accused had reached at the place of occurrence, snatched Rs.5000/- and had hit the complainant with a wrench with an intention to kill him. He further contends that in fact the petitioner was named as an accused due to previous enmity between the parties and he had no concern with the alleged offence. He further contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 23rd September 2025 and after completion of investigation, the *challan* has already been presented before the Court of

Area Magistrate on 10.02.2026. Even during the course of trial, charge was ordered to be framed against the petitioner and others on 23.02.2026. Moreover, the parties had already entered into a compromise vide compromise deed dated 02.02.2026 (Annexure P-3) and it was prayed that this Court may take a lenient view of the matter.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record very carefully.

5. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 7 months and the injured in the present case has already been discharged. Moreover, it is also evident from the compromise deed dated 02.02.2026 (Annexure P-3) that the parties have entered into a compromise and have amicably resolved all their disputes. Thus, no purpose will be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars and the petition deserves to be allowed.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

19.05.2026
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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