



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

222

CRM-M-408-2025
Decided on : 18.11.2025

Nobalpreet Singh @ Nobel . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Fateh Singh Bhullar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Bareen Pratap Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Nobalpreet Singh @ Nobel	162	15.07.2022	307, 427, 34 of IPC and S. 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act [S. 201 of IPC added later on]	City Tarn Taran	Tarn Taran

2. As per allegations levelled in FIR, on the day of incident, i.e., 15.07.2022 at about 3:00 PM, two young persons, came on a motorcycle, who were already known to the complainant – Bhagwant Singh. The boy who was driving the motorcycle was named as ‘Nobelpreet Singh @ Nobel’ and the pillioin rider was named as ‘Kirat Singh’. They stopped by parallel to the car of the complainant and started firing on the car with their pistols with the intention to kill the complainant – Bhagwant Singh and Jugrajt Singh. One of the bullets hit on the driver side door of the car and other bullet, hit on the



window glass of the car, due to which, glass of the window broke down. Bullet fired by Kirat Singh hit above the left knee of the complainant – Bhagwant Singh and the second bullet hit below his left knee, whereas, the shots fired by Nobelpreet Singh @ Nobel (petitioner herein), hit on the right thigh of Jugraj Singh (co-passenger of the complainant). As per the FIR, motive behind the incident was that there was a fight between both the parties about 20 days back from the date of incident.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that both the witnesses, i.e., complainant/injured – Bhagwant Singh and Jugraj Singh, have already appeared before the trial Court for deposing their respective versions, but both of them failed in identifying the petitioner – Nobelpreet Singh @ Nobel and co-accused Kirat Singh.

4. Even this Court has also perused the statement of Bhagwant Singh, who appeared as PW-3, and has deposed about the happening of the incident, as stated in the FIR, but in his other statement, he has not named the petitioner and also his other co-accused. Rather, it has categorically recorded in examination-in-chief that *“I do not identify accused present in the Court. The accused present today in the Court, did not opened fire upon us nor cause injuries to us. I am seeing them first time in the Court. I did not record my statement against the accused persons to the police.”*

Similarly other injured – Jugraj Singh, who appeared as PW-2 before the trial Court, who apart stating injuries suffered by complainant/injured – Bhagwant Singh, also deposed that the one bullet hit on the left leg of Bhagwant Singh near the knee and second bullet hit just below of the left knee and one bullet hit on his right thigh. However, he also refused to identify the accused, who was shown to him through V.C. Further stated in his



examination-in-chief that he is saying first time, and no such statement was got recorded earlier by him against he accused persons.

5. As pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioner, he is inside jail since 08.07.2023 and out of total 14 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far, including the two as discussed here-above. Thus, in view of above, it is prayed that the petitioner deserves to be extended the benefit of regular bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 17.11.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

7. Learned State counsel, while confirming the total period of incarceration of the petitioner as 02 years, 04 months and 05 days, also submits that out of a total of 14 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined so far. He fairly concedes that the complainant/injured – Bhagwant Singh and Jugraj Singh have not supported the prosecution case in its entirety during trial.

However, learned State counsel points out that the petitioner is also involved in another case, i.e., FIR No. 64, dated 04.07.2023, under Sections 379-B, 34 and 411 IPC, registered at Police Station Bhogpur, but in that case, the petitioner has already been released on bail, and thus, he is not a proved convict in any criminal case as of now.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, this Court finds the following factors relevant for consideration of the petitioner's prayer for bail:



- (i) Petitioner has undergone a substantial period of incarceration, i.e., 02 years, 04 months and 05 days (as on 17.11.2025), and the trial is progressing at a slow pace, as only 03 out of 14 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, indicating that the conclusion of trial is not likely in the near future.
- (ii) Two material witnesses, i.e., complainant/injured – Bhagwant Singh and Jugraj Singh, have already appeared before the trial Court, but have not supported the prosecution version in its entirety, including their specific refusal to identify the petitioner during trial. Although this Court refrains from expressing any opinion on the evidentiary value of such testimony, the fact remains that their depositions have already been recorded.
- (iii) Petitioner is a young person of about 23 years of age, has already suffered prolonged incarceration, and except one other case, where he is already on bail, he is not a proved convict. Keeping him confined for an indefinite period may serve no fruitful purpose, particularly when the trial is likely to take considerable time, and it would be more appropriate to allow him an opportunity to reform and rehabilitate himself in society.

In view of the totality of these circumstances, and the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.



Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.
Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.
Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 18, 2025
J.Ram

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