



218+244+324 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision:30.04.2025

(i) CRM-M-19510-2025

Inderjit Singh ...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

(ii) CRM-M-20455-2025

Amarjit Singh alias Laddi ...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

(iii) CRM-M-21363-2025

Gagandeep Singh @ Happy ...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Aminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner (in all petitions).

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.P.Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J.(oral)

1. This order shall dispose off above-said three petitions i.e. CRM-M-19510-2025, titled as Inderjit Singh Vs. State of Punjab, CRM-M-20455-2025 titled as Amarjit Singh @ Laddi Vs. State of Punjab and CRM-M-21363-2025 titled as Gagandeep Singh @ Happy Vs. State of Punjab, whereby the petitioners have prayed for grant of regular bail to them in case FIR No.58 dated 07.08.2024 registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 117(2), 351(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS Act (Section 238 of BNS added later on) and Section 25 of Arms Act, at Police Station Sherpur, District Sangrur.



2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the petitioners themselves are the victims in the present case as they were attacked by the opposite side and a cross-version has also been registered against the complainant side in the present case. He next contends that four persons, namely, Inderjit Singh, Amarjit Singh, Amandeep Singh and Harinderpreet Singh, on the side of the petitioners have suffered grievous injuries on their persons. Learned counsel further relies upon the photographs (Annexure P-3) to contend that the photographs have been developed from a CCTV footage of all the cameras, which were installed near the place of occurrence, which would clearly show that the complainant side had attacked the petitioner and his co-accused and serious injuries were inflicted on them.

3. As per him, Inderjit Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-19510-2025) was allegedly armed with a pistol and had fired at Amritpal. However, the bullet fired by the petitioner (Inderjit Singh) had just touched the forehead of the complainant and it was a superficial injury. He had allegedly fired another gun shot injury at Jasvir Singh, which allegedly touched his chin and below right eye and all these injuries were superficial in nature.

4. He further contends that as per the case of the prosecution, Amarjit Singh @ Laddi (petitioner in CRM-M-20455-2025) had also been assigned a false role that he had fired from his pistol and the bullets had hit Amritpal Singh. Even .32 bore pistol was planted on him by the police.

5. He next contends that Gagandeep Singh @ Happy (petitioner in CRM-M-21363-2025) had also allegedly fired at the complainant party in the present case and had asked them to come to the place of occurrence. Learned counsel further contends that the injured in the present case have already been



discharged and the petitioners are continuing in custody for the last almost 08 months. After completion of investigation, challan has been presented against them and no witness has been examined so far. Thus, further custody of the petitioners will not serve any meaningful purpose.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that all the petitioners had actively participated in the commission of crime and they were seen in the CCTV footage.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

8. It is apparent from the record that four persons on the side of the petitioners had suffered serious injuries on their persons. Moreover, the petitioners are in custody for the last 08 months and there are no material to suggest that the petitioners are in a position to influence the witnesses of the prosecution. Moreover, the injured on both the sides have already been discharged. Thus, further custody of the petitioners will not serve any meaningful purpose.

9. At this stage, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

30.04.2025
hemlata

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