

2026:PHHC:031109



IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

114

CRM-M-53644-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 26.02.2026

Jodhbir Singh @ Ranjodh Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Ms. Rahi Mehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 260 dated 12.11.2024, registered under Section 109 of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement got recorded by complainant Naresh Kumar, an official of Punjab Police, on the allegations that on 11.11.2024, while he was on patrolling duty along with other police officials near Noordi Road, Tarn Taran, he received secret information that a person with a muffled face was approaching the parking area on a motorcycle having no numberplate with intention to commit a crime. Acting on the said information, a barrier was laid near the railway track.

At about 12:05 AM, a person with a muffled face came from the city side on a

2026:PHHC:031109



motorcycle without registration number. When signalled to stop, the said person stopped the motorcycle, took out a pistol and fired at the police party with an intention to kill, as a result whereof the bullet hit the government vehicle. In retaliation, the police fired an aerial shot. However, the accused again fired towards the police party, though the shot went into the air. Thereafter, a shot fired by the police hit the accused, causing him to fall on the road along with his motorcycle. The pistol slipped from his hand and was recovered from the spot. The accused was apprehended at the spot and on inquiry disclosed his name as Jodhbir Singh @ Jodha, i.e. the present petitioner. He suffered disclosure statement to the effect that firearm used by him in the incident was brought from one Karambir Singh. He further disclosed that on 05.11.2024, he and Karambir Singh, while riding a motorcycle, had fired upon one Waheguru Singh, which hit on his gate and their companions were standing behind on other motorcycles, who used to commit crimes with them. The said motorcycle was found to be registered in the name of one Jarnail Singh. Investigation now stands completed and challan has been filed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The story put forth by the police party is concocted one. No injury was caused to any of the police officials. Rather, the petitioner himself had sustained injuries due to the shots fired by the police officials. Investigation has since been completed and challan has been presented before the Court. The trial is likely to take considerable time as only 06 witnesses have been examined so far out of total 11 prosecution witnesses. The petitioner has been in custody since 12.11.2024. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Although he is involved in some

2026:PHHC:031109



other cases also but that alone cannot be made a ground to deny him concession of bail. It is, thus, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, who had fired gunshots upon the police party on the fateful day, as well as his criminal antecedents, he is not entitled to get benefit of bail. It is, thus, argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have fired gunshots upon the police party on the fateful day. Admittedly, no police official had sustained any injury, whereas the petitioner himself sustained injuries during the incident due to the gunshots fired by the police officials in retaliation. The petitioner has been in custody since 12.11.2024. Investigation stands completed and challan has already been presented before the trial Court. Out of 11 prosecution witnesses, only 06 have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Pendency of other cases against him cannot be considered to be a ground for denying him bail in this case in the given circumstances. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other subsequent case.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for

2026:PHHC:031109



the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

26.02.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No