



260

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

CRM-M-18279-2025

Date of Decision:08.04.2025

RANDEEP SINGH

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

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

Present : Mr. H.S. Sandhu, Advocate with
Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepinder Singh Brar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S., with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.119 dated 13.09.2024, registered under Sections 103, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 & Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act (Sections 61(2), 249, 253 added later on), Police Station Sirhali, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner had no concern with the allegations levelled by the complainant in the present case and the only allegation against the petitioner is that he had harbored the co-accused. He further contends that at the worst, the offences under Sections 249 and 253 of BNS are made out against the petitioner and the same are bailable in



nature. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 03.10.2024 and is in custody for the last about 06 months. The challan has already been presented against him and further custody of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he admits that there is no other case against the petitioner.

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

5. As per the case of the prosecution, the only role assigned to the petitioner is that he had provided shelter to the co-accused and there is no allegation that the petitioner had participated in the occurrence in any manner. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about 06 months. Thus, further custody of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

08.04.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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