



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

244

CRM-M-37957-2025  
Decided on : 05.08.2025

Varinderpal Singh . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

PRESENT: Mr. Jasmeet Singh Ghuman, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Amit Chaudhary, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. In the instant regular bail petition on 23.07.2025, following order was passed:-

*"1. Present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 has been filed by the petitioner for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.08 dated 06.02.2025, under Sections 109, 132, 221, 3(5) BNS and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 238 and 345(3) BNS added later on, registered at Police Station Lohian, District Jalandhar Rural.*

*2. As per allegations, Police received a secret information that Dilbag Singh @ Baga, Sukhraj Singh @ Sukha @ Ricky along with his other accomplices had fired upon an NRI person in Shahkot area and they are absconding in that case.*

*While the accused persons were conspiring to carry out a major incident, they were armed with deadly weapons and were traveling in a Creta car (No. HR-10-1819), a Swift car (No. PB-67-D-0608), and an I20 car without number plate. If a raid is carried out without delay, all these persons can be apprehended and recoveries of cars and weapons could also be got effected.*

*3. It is further alleged in the FIR that by constituting a team, Police proceeded and near village Lasuri, an I-20 was seen coming from the field on the left hand dirt road. On seeing the Police party they turned towards Lasuri. Two unknown persons from the Creta car fired at Police party and fled towards the railway line and a person from swift car got out and started firing at the police party with an intention to kill the Police party.*



4. Resultantly, Police party had also to fire, which hit on the left leg of Sukhraj Singh @ Sukha @ Ricky. Name of the petitioner was disclosed subsequently by one of the accused Dilbag Singh @ Baga, though petitioner's name is not there in the FIR.

5. Counsel for the petitioner refers para 8 of the petition and submits that out of the total 08 cases registered till date, apart the present one. In 05 of the cases petitioner has already been acquitted and in one case under Section 307 IPC he was convicted and then sentenced to undergo for a period of one year.

6. In the case at serial No.7 of the table, a cancellation report has already been prepared. Thus proceedings in only one other case is pending. Petitioner has been implicated in the present case merely to increase the number of cases against him. The prosecution is relying solely on the disclosure statement, which is undoubtedly a weak kind of evidence and, by itself, cannot secure a conviction, unless the allegations arising from the disclosure statement are corroborated by some other substantive evidence.

For reference the table mentioned in para 8 of the petition is reproduced here as under:-

Sr.	FIR	PS	Date	U/S	Result
1.	157	Agroha, Hisar	4.8.2012	395	Acquitted
2.	109	Sultanpur Lodhi, KPT	8.6.2012	392, 336, 427, 34	Acquitted
3.	220	Phagwara, KPT	13.07.2008	420, 467, 468, 471	Acquitted
4.	37	Shahkot, Jal	24.2.2008	307, 323, 324, 325, 148, 149	Undergone (1 year)
5.	60	Shahkot, Jal	31.3.2008	419, 120-B	Acquitted
6.	195	Shahkot, Jal	19.09.2009	302, 34	Acquitted
7.	11	Shahkot, Jal	15.1.2025	109, 125, 324(4)	Cancellation report
8.	11	Shahkot, Jal	15.11.2025	109, 125, 324(4)	Pending

7. Thus prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the instant case.

8. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that he is not in a position to dispute the factual position explained in para No.8 of the petition, as the investigation is still in progress and for that purpose, he prays for grant of some time, to enable the prosecution to complete the investigation.

9. List on 01.08.2025.

10. Meanwhile, if any additional information is made available to the prosecution, apart what has been recorded in today's order, same be mentioned in the status report."

2. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner argues that, in fact, no one suffered any injury in the alleged incident. He submits that Section 109 of the BNS, 2023, has been added solely on account of the alleged use of a firearm.

Further submits that the petitioner's name does not figure in the FIR, and he has been implicated only on the basis of a disclosure statement



made by a co-accused. To establish the petitioner's false implication, counsel refers to the final outcome in five other cases, in which the petitioner has already been acquitted (as noticed in the previous order dated 23.07.2025 and reiterated here).

3. Learned counsel also contends that as the investigation has already been completed and the final report has been submitted before the trial Court, and since the trial is likely to take considerable time, the petitioner's personal liberty cannot be curtailed in the absence of any cogent and convincing evidence against him.

Accordingly, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in view of the aforesaid circumstances, petitioner may be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel is not in a position to controvert the factual submissions made by the petitioner's counsel. He also fairly concedes that no injury was suffered by any person, and Section 109 of the BNS, 2023, has been invoked solely due to the alleged use of a firearm. He further admits that the process of recording of the statements of prosecution witnesses is yet to commence, although the final report has been filed before the trial Court.

5. Heard.

6. Taking into consideration the submissions made on the previous date of hearing, i.e., 23.07.2025, as well as those addressed today, this Court finds that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was implicated only on the basis of a disclosure statement. Additionally, the petitioner stands acquitted in five out of a total of eight earlier cases. In the given



circumstances, I deem it appropriate to allow the prayer for regular bail made through the present petition.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

**August 05, 2025**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No*

*Whether Reportable: Yes/No*