

2026:PHHC:079725



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M No.27525 of 2026
Date of Decision: 20.05.2026

Sonu ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner (through Video Conferencing).

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
01	08.01.2024	City Zira, District Ferozepur	307, 336, 449, 427, 148 and 149 of IPC and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Mandeep Singh alleging therein that the relations between the family of the present petitioner and his own family were inimical as previously his uncle Veeru had got registered a

2026:PHHC:079725



case as against the family of the petitioner. The family of the petitioner was also involved in the business of drugs and that too had been got shut down by the family of the complainant. On the night of 07.01.2024, ceremonies of performance of marriage of his cousin brother Sukhchain Singh were going in the house of his uncle and at about 11 PM, the petitioner and his family members had pelted bricks and stones at his house. The police had been called and then the petitioner and his family members had fled from the spot. In the morning of 08.01.2024, the petitioner accompanied by the co-accused and 15-20 other persons not known to the complainant came in the house of his paternal uncle. They made exhortations. Accused Vishal @ Shali proclaimed that the family of the complainant should be taught a lesson for messing up with them. Then the petitioner, accused Vishal, Sukhpreet Singh and Ravi started firing shots with their respective weapons at the gate of house of his paternal uncle Gulshan @ Veeru. They also fired shots in the area. After breaking open the gate of house, they entered therein. The petitioner directly fired a shot at Amarjit Kaur @ Meeti aunt of the complainant with an intent to kill her. The bullet struck against her abdomen and she had fallen down. On raising alarm, the assailants fled away with their weapons. The injured was rushed to hospital. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 03.09.2024. Co-accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. A false recovery has been planted upon

2026:PHHC:079725



him. The case rests on concocted and fabricated version. No motive or specific injury has been attributed to him. It was the complainant party who was the aggressor. The ingredients for commission of subject offences are not at all attracted against him. He is in custody since long. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody. It is, thus argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab has advance notice of the petition. She has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner and is ready to argue the matter. It is submitted by her that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature since he was the person who had fired shot upon victim Amarjit Kaur with an intent to kill her. His antecedents are not clean as he is involved in several other cases. There are chances of his intimidating the witnesses or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof is alleged to have fired a shot with a pistol on the person of the victim Amarjit Kaur @ Meeti thereby injuring her with an intent to kill her. Though the allegations as levelled against the petitioner make out a prima facie case for commission



about 01 year and 08 months. The trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as so far none out of 22 prosecution witnesses has been examined. Pre trial incarceration of the petitioner is not going to serve any fruitful purpose. The well settled proposition of law is that pre trial incarceration of an accused should not be a replica of post conviction sentencing. The detention prior to trial should not become punitive. On account of his involvement in other cases, the petitioner cannot be denied benefit of bail. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

20.05.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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