



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

219

**CRM-M No.45472of 2025 (O&M)  
Reserved on :26.08.2025  
Pronounced on: 28.08.2025**

**Arjun Singh**

**.....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab**

**..... Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH**

**Argued by:** Mr.Gaurav Kalsi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, DAG, Punjab.

**SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):**

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 126(2) 109, 118(1), 115(2), 191(3), 190, 351, 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, (Sections 118(2) of BNS was added lateron) a FIR, i.e. FIR No.15 dated 26.02.2025, has been lodged in Police Station Sadar Pathankot, District Pathankot. With regard to commission of above mentioned offence, the petitioner has been arrested and he is in custody since then. Seeking a prayer for release on bail this is the first petition filed by the petitioner.

2. In nutshell, the facts projected by the prosecution are that FIR of this case came into being on the statement of complainant Jodh Singh who, stated that he is a truck driver by profession and engaged as tractor driver by Municipal Corporation Pathankot, through a private contractor. According to complainant on 25.02.2025, when he was loading garbage truck, at about 9.15



A.M he was about to start his tractor. There four boys came on two motorcycles one of them Arjun son of Beera. As per complainant Arjun Singh and one unknown assailant were armed with dattars (sharp edged weapon) and one unknown assailant armed with baseball bat. According to complainant the 4<sup>th</sup> assailant namely Jaggi, son of paternal aunt of Virsa Singh blocked his way with the help of motorcycle and thereafter Jaggi exhorted to launch an attack upon him wherein he suffered injury.

3. Heard.

4. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has already suffered sufficient incarceration and that he has been falsely implicated in the present case without any reasons. According to learned counsel for the petitioner any injury suffered by the complainant has not been declared dangerous to life and that trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and therefore, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has argued that name of the petitioner specifically crops up in the FIR and a prominent role has been attributed to him. According to learned State counsel in view of gravity of offence, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. A perusal of the record shows that in the present case that there are several important factors which needs consideration for the decision on the above mentioned bail application. Those factors are:-

1. that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 4 months and 18 days;
2. that the investigation in this case is already complete and nothing is



- left to be recovered from the possession of the petitioner;
3. that the trial in the present case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
  4. that any injury suffered by the victim though grievous, has not been declared as dangerous to life;
  5. that the petitioner has already been discharged from the hospital;
  6. that detention of petitioner behind the bar is not likely to serve any purpose;
  7. that although the petitioner is facing two other cases also, but both of them are not serious in nature.
8. The cumulative effect of all the above mentioned factors leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.
9. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court.

**(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**Pronounced on: 28.08.2025**

*Manoj Bhutani*

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