



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(237)

CRM-M NO.9489-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 29.04.2025

Satpal Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present Ms. Gurinderjit Kaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Shiva Khurmi, AAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J (ORAL)

1. Petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.18 dated 31.01.2022, under Sections 323, 341, 506 and 307 IPC, added lateron, registered at Police Station Passiana, District Patiala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 29.08.2023 for allegedly inflicting injury on the head of injured Raju, which was subsequently opined to be dangerous to life. It has been submitted that the trial has not yet concluded and, therefore, petitioner deserves the concession of bail. Since, there is no possibility of the trial concluding in the near future coupled with the fact that all the material witnesses stand examined.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Nirmal Singh, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the



counsel opposite has reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR which stand reproduced here as under:-

“First Information contents (Attach separate sheet, if necessary): At this time an entry is made that a written complaint made by Rekha wife of Raju Singh, resident of Village Bhanari, Police Station Pasyana, District Patiala, aged 30 years, Mobile No.78148-26791, sent by ASI Bhagwant Singh 3121/Patiala, Mamura, Police Post Dakala, Police Station Pasyana, for registration of case against Satpal Singh son of Kuldeep Singh, resident of Village Bhanari, Police Station Paasyana, District Patiala under sections 341, 323, 506 IPC through PHG Kewal Chand 29921 received in police station, subject of which is: "Stated that I am resident of aforementioned address and is a home maker. My husband are two brothers. My elder brother-in-law is Satpal Singh of Kuldeep Singh, resident of Village Bhanari, Police Station Pasyana, District Patiala. He is our neighbour and is habitual of consuming intoxicants like liquor etc. On the day of Friday on 29.01.2022 at about 09.30 p.m., my brother-in-law Satpal Singh was giving beatings to his wife. On hearing noise, me and my husband went to their house to disengage them. When my husband tried to save wife of Satpal Singh from his clutches, my brother-in-law started giving danda blows to my husband, which he had in his hand. When my husband tried to escape himself by running away, my brother-in-law Satpal Singh cornered him and gave several danda blows on the head of my husband Raju Singh. I raised hue and cry and on hearing my noise, Gaggan, a resident of our village, was passing through street and with whom my husband is working, also reached at the spot. Further, on seeing several people gathering, my brother-in-law Satpal Singh, while extending threat to kill my husband, fled away from the spot along with his danda. On seeing the injuries sustained by my husband on his head, I shifted him to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala in the vehicle of Gaggan. Doctor referred him at Chandigarh and I got him admitted him at PGI, Chandigarh, where surgery has been conducted on his head and he is in unconscious condition. Today I along with my brother Bhim Singh son of Ved Parkash, resident of House No.866/2, Rajiv Colony, Sector 17, Panchkula, Haryana, was coming to Police



Post Dakala to give complaint. You have met us at bus stand of village Kallarbhaini, where, I, in the presence of my brother have got recorded my statement to you. The same has been heard and is correct. Appropriate legal action be taken.”

4. It has been argued by learned State counsel that it is not simpliciter a case wherein a single blow was given on the head of the injured Raju rather it is a case wherein injured Raju rushed to the rescue of his sister-in-law (wife of the petitioner) while she was being physically assaulted by the petitioner; the petitioner then inflicted repeated blows on injured Raju's head resulting in the injuries which were subsequently noticed by the attending doctor. It has also been submitted, on instructions, that all the material witnesses including the complainant as well as injured Raju had supported the case of the prosecution in its entirety; only three witnesses out of 16 remained to be examined and therefore, there were every likelihood that the case would conclude in the very near future. A prayer has therefore, been made by the learned counsel for dismissal of the instant petition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

6. The petitioner is none other than the real brother of injured Raju, who was inflicted multiple blows on his head with a “*danda*”. As per instructions received, all the material witnesses reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR against the petitioner and stood their ground.

7. This Court, therefore, does not deem it fit to admit the petitioner on bail moreso when the trial is nearing conclusion.

8. The present petition is therefore dismissed.

9. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

29.04.2025
mamta

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No