



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

269

**CRM-M-17375-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 21.04.2025**

MALKEET SINGH

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. P.B.S. Goraya, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Ms. Akshita, Advocate for the complainant

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
65	04.08.2024	332, 115(2), 324, 351, 191(3), 190 BNS; [118(2) BNS added later on vide DDR No.20 dated 11.08.2024]	Valtoha, District Tarn Taran

2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that the complainant happens to be the brother-in-law of the



petitioner and on account of some misunderstanding the instant FIR has been got registered. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 07.02.2025 and the alleged injury attributed to the petitioner is on the right little finger of the complainant. He further submits that with the intervention of respectables a compromise has been effected between the parties, whereby the complainant had given a duly sworn affidavit (Annexure P-1) in this regard. He further submits that the petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents. Thus prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report filed by the State has opposed the petition considering the gravity of the offence.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has admitted the factum of compromise having been effected between the parties voluntarily and without any force and coercion. She submits that the complainant has no objection in grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that as per the allegations the petitioner is alleged to have given injury on the right little finger of the complainant. The petitioner is in custody since 07.02.2025 and during the course of proceedings, a compromise has been effected between the parties and the complainant has given a duly sworn affidavit (Annexure P-1) in this regard. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has categorically stated that the complainant has no objection in grant of bail to the petitioner. The petitioner



is not having any criminal antecedents and the criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner, could only be determined after the conclusion of trial, which may take sufficient long time. In the circumstances, no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any longer.

7. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Judge on Duty/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

21.04.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No