

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

2025:PHHC:039865



(228)

**CRM-M-64961-2024**

**Date of Decision: 24.03.2025**

Kawaljit Singh @ Bahadur

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL.**

Present:- Mr. Ramnish Puri, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, AAG, Punjab with  
SI Ranjit Singh.

\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL.J (Oral)**

The petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail, filed under Section 483 of BNSS, in case FIR No.244, dated 30.10.2024, under Sections 109, 190, 191, 115(2) BNS and sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station, City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it is a case of version and cross-version, wherein both the sides received injuries at the hands of each other. It is a matter of record that two persons from the side of the petitioner sustained fire arm injuries on chest and calf, whereas the opposite side i.e. the complainant in the FIR version received a single fire arm injury on a non-vital part of the body i.e. the foot. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that there was medical evidence also to corroborate the ocular testimony, which finds detailed in the DDR, which was recorded at the instance of the accused party on 04.11.2024. It has been asserted by the counsel that the injuries sustained

by two persons on his side could not fabricated or self-inflicted injuries. Counsel has argued that in the circumstances, more so since the investigation in the present case is complete coupled with the fact that no specific role or injury has been attributed to the petitioner other than he being shown to be a part of the unlawful assembly, the petitioner deserves to be extended the concession of bail.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite has not disputed that it is a case of version and cross-version, wherein both the sides received injuries at the hands of the other. It has also not been disputed that the investigation in the present case is complete with the challan having been presented. However, learned State counsel has asserted that the petitioner is involved in 6 other criminal cases including cases under the BNS and NDPS Act. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed that the petitioner has not been attributed any specific injury, much less with a fire arm on the person of the injured from the other side. Learned State counsel has however, submitted that the petitioner was armed with a fire arm and as many as four shots were fired by the accused from different weapons; only one fire arm injury was sustained by complainant Luvpreet Singh.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 02.11.2024 in a case of version and cross-version. Investigation in the present case is complete with the challan having been presented on 29.01.2025. As many as 16 prosecution witnesses have been cited, hence, the possibility of the trial concluding in the near future looks remote as the next date fixed by the

Trial Court is 02.04.2025 when the charges are likely to be framed.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to grant to the petitioner the concession of bail.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**24.03.2025**

lucky

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No