



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

219

**CRM-M-7420-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:- 23.05.2025**

SURJEET SINGH ALIAS JEETU

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY**

Present : Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Surender Singh, A.A.G. Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)**

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Dated</b>	<b>Sections</b>	<b>Police Station</b>
246	12.06.2024	323, 324, 341, 506 and 34 IPC; 25 Arms Act; (325, 326, 307 IPC added later on and 25 Arms Act deleted later on)	Sadar Fatehabad, District Fatehabad

2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that as per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner is only alleged to have manhandled with the complainant with no specific injury



being attributed to him. He is in custody since 27.06.2024 and even during the course of proceedings of investigation, the offence under Section 25 of the Arms Act has been deleted. He further submits that after the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time. Thus, prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the reply filed by the State has opposed the petition on the ground that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence and does not deserve the concession of bail and prays for dismissal of the petitioner.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner is alleged to have been holding a pistol at the time of occurrence and having manhandled with the complainant party in the occurrence. It is evident from the perusal of the reply filed by the State that offence under Section 25 of the Arms Act was deleted in the present case on 29.06.2024 as the petitioner was not found holding any pistol at the time of occurrence. It is not disputed that no specific overt act has been attributed to the petitioner. The main injury in the abdomen has been attributed to co-accused Vicky. The petitioner is in custody since 27.06.2024 and after the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court, wherein the prosecution has cited 21 witnesses, however, only 03 have been examined till date. The criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner, could only be determined after the



conclusion of trial, which may take sufficient long time. In the circumstances, no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any longer.

6. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Judge on Duty/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

7. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

8. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

**(SANJIV BERRY)**  
**JUDGE**

**23.05.2025**

*S.Sharma(syr)*

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No