

BA-101-2025

State Vs. Kajanpreet Singh

FIR No.32 dated 15.03.2025

U/S : 333/118(1)/118(2)/115(2)/191(3)/190 of BNS, 2023

PS : City Rampura.

Present:- Sh. GS Grewal Advocate for applicant/accused.
Sh. Sahil Jindal, APP for the State.

Heard on the bail application filed by the accused/applicant Kajanpreet Singh for the offences under Sections 333,118(1),118(2), 115(2),191(3),190 of BNS, 2023

In this application, it is submitted that accused has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that accused/applicant was not even present at the place of occurrence and he had never participated in the commission of offences as alleged. No motive has been disclosed by complainant in causing injuries to him by accused/applicant and his co-accused. Applicant was doing job in Jai Durga Factory, Near Stelco Factory & Fly Over, Rampura Phul at the time of alleged occurrence and he was present at his work place. Further, it is submitted that alleged offence under Section 333 of BNS is not made out in this case. He is in judicial custody and no more required by the police for further investigation and nothing to be recovered from applicant. As such, learned counsel for accused/applicant has prayed for release of accused/applicant on bail.

Notice being served, learned APP for the State, has opposed the bail application on the ground that accused/applicant has committed serious offences. As such, prayer for dismissal of the present bail application has been made.

I have heard the contradictory versions of the contesting parties and have deliberated over the arguments advanced in the light of documents, peculiar facts and circumstances and submissions made and gone through the judicial record.

Record perused. The present case has been registered against accused for the commission of offences punishable under Section 333/118(1)/118(2)/115(2)/191(3)/190 of BNS, 2023. The allegations leveled against accused are serious in nature and a specific role has been attributed to

him by complainant. Moreover, the offence under Section 118(2) of BNS is punishable with imprisonment of life. So, considering the gravity of offences involved in this case, I am of the view that accused/applicant is not entitled to the concession of bail in this case as there is every apprehension that after being enlarged on bail accused will tamper with the evidence and will influence the witnesses. Accordingly the present bail application is ordered to be **dismissed**. Papers be attached with the remand papers.

Pronounced.
Date:17.04.2025.

Manoj Kumar JW

Mamta Kakkar,
Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate,
Phul. UID No. PB00359