

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:010199



217

CRM-M-61560-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision:23.01.2026

Manpreet Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Abhishek Joon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

...

**Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.153, dated 12.10.2024, registered under Sections 110, 3(5), 61(2), 324(4) of the BNS and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Passiana, District Patiala.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant – Mastan Singh on 12.10.2024, alleging that on 11.10.2024, he had reached Ramnagar Chowk in his truck, when he was intercepted by occupants of a white coloured Brezza car bearing registration No.PB-11CP-6996 that was lying parked in the middle

of the road, four youths alighted from the same, one was holding a pistol and directly fired a shot towards his truck. A bullet had hit his right shoulder. One of them made an exhortation while addressing another as Manpreet Singh. The Police vehicle had reached there in the meanwhile. All of them fled away. He was rushed to the hospital. By alleging that the incident had occurred at the behest of Judgejit Singh @ Judge, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Accused Judgejit Singh @ Judge was arrested on 05.12.2025. He suffered disclosure statement and in pursuance thereof, got recovered a .32 bore pistol. The petitioner was arrested on 11.07.2025. The Brezza car, one licensed pistol along with magazine, 08 live cartridges and license of the pistol had been recovered from him in pursuance of his disclosure statement. Investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody for over a period of 06 months. A compromise has arrived between him and the complainant. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He does not have criminal antecedents. Therefore, it is, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report and custody certificate have been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. There are chances of his absconding, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, stressed that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned

counsel for the parties.

7. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have made an attempt to kill the complainant by firing a shot with pistol towards him. The victim had sustained simple injury. The petitioner has placed on record Annexure P-2, photocopy of the compromise, claimed to have been arrived at between himself, co-accused and the complainant and his counsel has argued in pursuance of this compromise, the petitioner deserves to be released on bail, though, in the opinion of this Court, veracity of this compromise cannot be decided at this stage and hence, the same cannot be taken into consideration. A prima facie case for commission of the subject offence is made out against the petitioner. However, taking into consideration the period of his incarceration, the fact that the trial will take considerable time to conclude since only 02 out of 25 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the nature of injuries sustained by the victim, clean antecedents of the petitioner and further in view of the well settled proposition of law that pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post conviction sentencing and the bail is the rule and jail is an exception, a case is made out for release of the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, made clear that any observation made hereinabove is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

23.01.2026

*harjeet*

Whether speaking/reasoned :  
Whether reportable :

(MANISHA BATRA)

JUDGE

Yes/No  
Yes/No