



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

221

CRM-M-26542-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 14.10.2025

Adarsh Singh @ Adarshdeep Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Rahul Bhargava, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Adarsh Singh @ Adarshdeep Singh	87	21.11.2024	109, 125, 115(2), 118(1), 351(1), 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 & 25 of the Arms Act, 1959	Tarsikka	Amritsar (Rural)

2. As per allegations, the petitioner – Adarsh Singh @ Adarshdeep Singh (armed with a pistol), along with his accomplices, namely, Karandeep Singh @ Baggi (armed with pistol), Jugraj Singh @ Jagga Singh (armed with datar), Chandanbir Singh (armed with datar), Baljeet Singh @ Balli (armed with datar), and 5–6 other unknown persons, attacked the complainant/injured party after co-accused Arshdeep Singh raised a *lalkara* to teach a lesson to Chamkor Singh. It is alleged that the petitioner fired two rounds from his pistol directly at Chamkor Singh, which hit near the knee of his left leg.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner has been in custody for more than 10 months. As per the allegations, the gunshot fired by the petitioner hit only the non-vital part of the body of the injured –



Chamkor Singh, and there was no attempt to fire upon any vital part. Therefore, it would be a moot question during trial whether there existed any actual intention to cause murder or not.

Further contends that, had there been any real intention to kill the injured, the petitioner would have fired towards a vital organ such as chest or abdomen. Except for the allegation of firing towards the knee of injured, no other specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. Hence, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while vehemently opposing the prayer for bail, refers to the status report dated 05.08.2025 and submits that there are three injured persons, namely, Chamkor Singh, Shokeen Singh (complainant), and Baljeet Singh. It is pointed out that Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 307 IPC), has been invoked as petitioner allegedly fired shots at the injured Chamkor Singh, thereby showing an intent to cause murder.

Learned State counsel further submits that, considering the gravity of the offence, petitioner does not deserve any leniency, as there is a reasonable apprehension that he may pressurize witnesses or evade the process of law, if released on bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully perused the record, including the FIR and status report. Undoubtedly, the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner that whether there was an intention to cause murder or not, would be a moot question during the course of trial, as the injury sustained by Chamkor Singh is on non-vital part of the body. There is no allegation that the petitioner aimed or fired at any vital part of the body of injured Chamkor Singh.

It is also noticed that petitioner has been in custody for more than 10 months, investigation stands concluded, and challan has been presented before the learned trial Court. Out of a total of 15 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far, indicating that the conclusion of the trial shall take a considerable amount of time. Therefore, keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the petitioner's plea for regular bail, as his liberty



cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period.

6. Accordingly, 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.

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

8. 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.

9. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

October 14, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No