



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35711-2025

Reserved on: 21<sup>st</sup> August, 2025

Pronounced on: 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2025

Amarbir Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Sukhmeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.


Mr. Vivek Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 05 dated 08.01.2025 registered under Sections 109, 126(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station IT City, District SAS Nagar.

2. As per the allegations, on the intervening night of 07/08.01.2025, the complainant Ekamdeep Singh, along with his friend Inderpal Singh, was going from Patiala to Chandigarh in his Etios make car, while on the way, they stopped at a grocery shop at Banaur to purchase something. The youths, who were riding on a black-coloured Splendor motorbike, had come to them and had a conversation with them for a while. When the complainant and his friend left the shop, those youths started following the complainant on their bike and after passing some distance,



they gave a signal to stop their vehicle. Out of fear, the complainant increased the speed of his car and took a turn towards the airport chowk. However, those youths managed to overtake his vehicle and intercepted him by stopping their bike in front of his car. Thereafter, one of them alighted from the motorbike. He took out a pistol from his waist bag and fired a shot with the same towards the complainant with an intention to kill him. The shot hit the left shoulder of Inderpal Singh. The assailant fired 3-4 more shots, one of which hit the back of the complainant. One of those youths made an exhortation to kill the complainant and his companion. However, to save his life, he managed to sped away on his car from there. Both of them were got admitted in the hospital. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, the petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was arrested on 15.01.2025. Recovery of 1.32 bore pistol and one live cartridge was effected from him.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has been in custody since 15.01.2025. A false recovery has been planted upon the petitioner. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. *Per contra*, it is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, that there are serious allegations against the petitioner who, along with the co-accused, made an attempt to commit murder of the complainant and his friend by firing shots with pistol. Multiple injuries had been sustained by the complainant and his friend. The petitioner is a habitual offender as several other cases of similar nature have been registered against him. There are chances of his committing similar offences, intimidating the



witnesses, or absconding, if extended benefit of will. Therefore, it is argued that the petitioner does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner, along with the co-accused, is alleged to have made attempt to commit murder of the complainant and his friend by firing shots with pistol upon them. Both the victims had sustained firearm injuries, which are obviously dangerous to life. The petitioner has criminal antecedents since, as per the custody certificate, he has been involved in four cases of similar nature. He has not been extended benefit of bail in either of these cases. Apprehension expressed by the State that the petitioner may intimidate the witnesses, abscond or committing similar offences cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. Keeping in view the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail, his antecedents, and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits of the case, lest they prejudice the trial, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**1<sup>st</sup> September, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes / No*  
2. *Whether reportable* : *Yes / No*