

2025:PHHC:134882



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

215

**CRM-M-24177-2025
Date of decision: 25.09.2025**

AJAYPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 110 dated 20.12.2024 registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109, 190 of the BNS, 2023 and under Section 25 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station Mohkampura, Amritsar.

2. As per the allegations, the complainant, Prince, was engaged in catering work. On 18.12.2024, he was distributing voting slips in various houses in support of candidate Shinder, affiliated with the Congress party. At about 10:00 p.m., when the complainant reached Chugiawala Chowk along with his friend Dhiraj, they were intercepted and surrounded by accused Sajjan @ Vishal, Kuldeep Singh @ Chand, Ajay, and Shubham @ Chini.



CRM-M-24177-2025

-2-

The accused are alleged to have exhorted one another that the complainant be taught a lesson for distributing slips in favour of candidate Shinder. Thereafter, they began assaulting the complainant. It is further alleged that accused Ajay fired 3–4 gunshots towards the complainant with the intention to kill him. However, the complainant was saved by his friend Dhiraj, who pushed him aside. On hearing the commotion, people from the locality gathered at the spot, whereupon the assailants fled.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that even though the case set up by the prosecution is that 3/4 shots towards complainant with an intention to kill, however, there is no injury sustained by any person. He further submits that no weapon has been recovered by the respondents on the basis whereof the petitioner may be linked to the filing of the said shots. It is submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 17.02.2025 and charges are yet to be framed but no prosecution witness has been examined.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid facts, however, he submits that on 17.07.2025, this Court had adjourned the matter for today so as to facilitate examination of the complainant.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. It is not in dispute that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and that no injury has been caused to any person in the said incident of firing of shots allegedly by the petitioner. Further, even though

**CRM-M-24177-2025**

-3-

the charge-sheet was filed and charge stands framed, however, despite two opportunities having been granted in July and September, 2025, the complainant has chosen not to appear. It seems that the complainant is seeking to take advantage of the order passed on 17.07.2025 and avoiding deposition before the Court on purpose.

7. Noticing the circumstances as above and taking into consideration the age of the petitioner as well as the period of actual custody and the stage of trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

8. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

SEPTEMBER 25, 2025*Vishal Sharma***(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No