



CRM-M-11175-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-11175-2025
Decided on : 28.04.2025

Prabhjot Singh @ Dhillon

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Mohd. Jameel, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Amarjeet Kaur, Advocate, for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.142 dated 25.10.2024, registered under Sections 109(1), 333, 115(2), 126(2), 351(3), 190, 191(3) of BNS, 2023, at



Singh, but in the meantime, one white coloured Verna Car came from Malerkotla side, which was being driven by Jaskaran Singh and alongwith him Gagandeep Singh son of Devinder Singh and Dilpreet Singh and two other unidentified persons were sitting in the car. Gagandeep Singh son of Devinder Singh accelerated the car towards him with intention to kill him and the car hit on both of his legs. Then the car driver reverse the car and tried to run over him, however, he managed to save himself. Gagandeep Singh son of Devinder Singh, Jaskaran Singh, Dilpreet Singh and both the unidentified persons armed with iron rods started beating him. He raised alarm, however, the above-said persons with their respective weapons entered his house. They encircled Manjot Singh in the verandah of the house and gave him beating. After causing injuries, they escaped in the same car and the motorcycle by threatening him. Request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 29.10.2024 and thus, on the conclusion of the investigation, challan was presented. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Malerkotla, praying for grant of regular bail. However, learned Court after hearing both the sides, finding no merit in the petition filed by the petitioner, dismissed the same vide order dated 24.12.2024. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner has not been alleged to have committed



any overt act, however, he has been implicated in the present case on account of political rivalry in the village. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner alongwith the co-accused have formed unlawful assembly. They were duly armed and caused injuries to the complainant, thus, the intention on the part of the petitioner was evident. He submits that only challan has been presented in the case at this stage and charges are yet to be framed. Thus, keeping in view the gravity of the offence, no case is made out for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner alongwith the co-accused has played an active role in the commission of offence. She submits that the ocular version is medically corroborated and the complainant has suffered five injuries. She, thus, submits that no ground for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner alongwith the co-accused had formed unlawful assembly. The dispute between the parties is on account of the rivalry in Panchayat Election in which the complainant had succeeded. As per MLR, the complainant has suffered five injuries. The accused were duly armed. So far only challan has been presented and charges are yet to be framed. Thus, it is apparent that the trial is at its initial stage and granting



bail to the petitioner at this stage, would prejudice the ongoing trial. Keeping in view facts and circumstances of the case and the stage of the trial, this Court finds that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail at this stage. Thus, finding no merit in the present case, the same is hereby dismissed.

6. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

28.04.2025
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No