



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

CRM-M-60696-2024

Date of decision: 14.01.2025

VIKRAMJEET SINGH @ KAMLI

....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: - Mr. Lakshay Bector, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) in pursuance to the petitioner being summoned by the learned Trial Court under Section 319 Cr.P.C. vide order dated 14.02.2024 (Annexure P-6).

Details of FIR are as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
61	03.04.2022	302, 323, 506, 148, 149, 120-B of IPC and 302 of IPC was deleted and offence under Section 304 of IPC was added.	Tibba, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the order passed by this Court on 04.12.2024, the petitioner has appeared before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana on 20.12.2024 and furnished the requisite bail bonds.

3. This aspect is not disputed by learned State counsel.



CRM-M-60696-2024

2

4. During the course of hearing on 04.12.2024, following order was passed:

“ 2. It is, inter alia, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that after thorough inquiry into the matter and on conclusion of investigation, challan was not presented against the present petitioner as he was found innocent. However, during the course of trial on the application moved by the complainant, learned Trial Court has summoned the petitioner as an additional accused on an application preferred under Section 319 Cr.P.C without there being any specific attribution to the petitioner. He contends that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged offence. He contends that the trial is pending in the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, for 20.12.2024

3. It is further contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that vide the connected petition, i.e. CRM-M-48677-2024, ‘Bhupinder Singh Sandhu vs. State of Punjab and another’, co-accused of ”the petitioner, namely Bhupinder Singh Sandhu, has already been granted the concession of bail vide order dated 29.11.2024 and the case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused (supra).

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajinder Singh Bhatta, DAG, Punjab, present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State-respondent and, does not disputed the factual matrix of the case qua the case having the case of the petitioner at par with the co-accused (supra). He prays for time to file the status report/reply in the matter.

6. Adjourned to 14.01.2025.

7. Needful be done well before the date fixed with an advance copy to the counsel opposite.

**CRM-M-60696-2024**

3

8. *In the meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to appear before the learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate on or before 20.12.2024 and in that event, learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate will admit the petitioner on interim bail subject to its satisfaction on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds.”*

5. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has already appeared in the Court and furnished his requisite bail/surety bonds consequent to the order dated 04.12.2024, passed by this Court, the present petition is allowed. The order dated 14.02.2024, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, is set aside and the interim bail granted vide order dated 04.12.2024 is hereby confirmed.

6. The petition stands allowed.

7. It is made clear that anything contained hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

14.01.2025

kanika

i) Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No

ii) Whether reportable? Yes/No