



CRM-M-35885-2026

-1-

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

220

CRM-M-35885-2026

Date of decision : 10.07.2026

RANJIT SINGH

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. N.P.S. Mann, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.05 dated 02.02.2026, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 323, 324, 326 and 506 IPC), at Police Station Talwandi Chaudhriyan, District Kapurthala.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Tarsem Singh, who alleged that on 24.01.2026 at about 11:30 p.m., when he along with his brother Narinder Singh was loading carrots in a rented vehicle for taking the same to the vegetable market, the petitioner came there in his Duster car under the influence of liquor and started abusing him. On being objected to by the complainant, the petitioner allegedly took out a Datar (machete) from his car and inflicted several blows upon the



complainant, which hit him on his head, hands, arm, leg and foot. Thereafter, the petitioner allegedly fled away from the spot along with the weapon.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and it is a case of version and cross-version, wherein both sides sustained injuries. It is submitted that immediately after the occurrence, the petitioner himself went to CHC Tibba, Kapurthala, where he was medically examined on 25.01.2026 and six injuries were found on his person, however, no action was taken by the police on his version. It is further submitted that there is an unexplained delay of about 08 days in lodging the FIR. Learned counsel further submits that as per the MLR of the complainant, all the injuries are simple in nature except one injury on the little finger of the left hand (non-vital part of the body), which was declared grievous in nature. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 02 months and 29 days and is not involved in any other case. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial qua the petitioner is likely to take a long time as none of the prosecution witness has been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 02 months and 29 days. He, upon instructions, submits that none of the prosecution witness has been examined so far.



6. Mr. K.S. Brar, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed the Memorandum of Appearance in Court, which is taken on record. He submits that in view of the seriousness of the offence, the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of regular bail.

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

8. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 02 months and 29 days, he is not involved in any other case, there is a delay of 08 days in lodging the FIR and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as none of the prosecution witness has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

July 10, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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