



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-6369-2025
Decided on : 24.07.2025

Satnam Singh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jupinder Pal Singh Brar, Advocate (through V.C.)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. At the outset, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 23.07.2025 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.

2. 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
Satnam Singh	11	08.02.2024	307, 34 of IPC & 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959	Balianwali	Bathinda

3. While referring to paragraph No.5 of the petition, wherein the role attributed to the petitioner and his co-accused has been detailed, learned counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner – Satnam Singh was allegedly armed with a revolver and he caused an injury on the forehead of



injured – Gagandeep Singh, with the butt of the revolver, which was opined by the Doctor as grievous in nature, whereas, fire shot on the back of the injured – Gagandeep Singh was found to be simple in nature.

To substantiate this submission, learned counsel refers to the medical opinion dated 09.04.2024, given by Dr. Rajan, MO, Civil Hospital, Balianwali (Annexure P-3).

4. Learned counsel further argues that after completion of investigation and submission of challan, charges were framed on 17.07.2024, and thereupon, two prosecution witnesses, i.e., complainant – Sukhchain Singh (as PW1) and injured – Gagandeep Singh (as PW2), have been examined on 16.12.2024 and 12.03.2025, respectively. There are total 28 prosecution witnesses and only two have been examined so far. Petitioner being inside jail for more than 01 year and 05 months, counsel prays for consideration of his plea for regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the contentions raised by the petitioner's counsel. However, he admits that the petitioner is already in jail for a period of 01 year, 05 months and 12 days, and is not found involved in any other criminal case.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.

7. It is noticeable that petitioner is already there inside jail for a period of more than 01 year and 05 months and the material prosecution witnesses, i.e., complainant and injured, Sukhchain Singh as PW1 and Gagandeep Singh as PW2, have already been examined, and there is a long list of witnesses who are yet to be examined. Therefore, release of the petitioner may not affect the proceeding of the trial. Thus, I deem it



appropriate to entertain the petitioner's plea for regular bail, as further custody of the petitioner would not be of any purpose for the prosecution.

8. 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. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

12. At this stage, learned State counsel submits that as per instructions received by him, none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined. Therefore, it is clarified that in case the contention of learned counsel for the petitioner, *qua* recording of statements of two of the material witnesses, i.e., PW1 & PW2 – complainant and injured, is found to be incorrect, it shall be open for the prosecution to seek cancellation of the bail, which has been granted today.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 24, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: ☒ Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: ☒ Yes/~~No~~