



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

CRM-M-4617-2025

Date of Decision:04.03.2025

Aryan Singh

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present : Mr. Nitin Sachdeva, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ashish Naik, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to him in case FIR No. 134, dated 19.08.2024, registered under Sections 109,191(3),190,125 of B.N.S. and 25 of Arms Act, Police Station Division No.5, Commissionerate Ludhiana (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that it has been wrongly alleged that a Breeza car was driven by the petitioner and his co-accused namely Deepa Purewal, who had allegedly fired gun shots at the car of the complainant. In fact, no such incident had taken place and no one had suffered any injury in the present case. In fact, the FIR in the present case was got registered by the complainant due to some old enmity between the parties. He further contends that apparently no person had suffered any injury in the

present case and the offence under Section 109 of B.N.S has been wrongly added. He further contends that in the present case co-accused Amit Gupta and Mohit have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail and Gagandeep Singh, co-accused has been granted the concession of regular bail. He further contends that the car, which was used in the commission of crime has already been recovered by the police.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

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

5. In the present case, it is also admitted that no person had suffered injuries in the incident. Moreover, the car, which was used in the commission of crime has already been recovered by the police and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

6. Thus, without commenting any further, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Sections 482 (2) of B.N.S.S. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join the investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and he shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S alongwith the following other conditions:-

(i) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.

(ii) The petitioner shall surrender his passport, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case he is not holder of the same, he shall swear

an affidavit to that effect.

(iii) The petitioner shall also file his affidavit before the concerned I.O./Arresting Officer, mentioning his ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by him during the pendency of the case. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, he shall share the details with the concerned Investigating Officer.

(iv) In case, the petitioner involve in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the case, it shall be viewed seriously and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move a petition for cancellation of bail granted to him.

(v)The petitioner shall report on every 1st Monday of English calender month to the concerned I.O and I.O shall mark his presence by making an entry in the Rojnamcha.

04.03.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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