

CRM-M-13435-2025

2025:PHHC:146112



212

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13435-2025

Date of decision: October 27, 2025

Gursewak Singh @ Karan

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**Present:-** Mr. Gopal Singh Nahel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Sra, Additional AG Punjab.

Mr. K.D.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

Present second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.34 dated 17.07.2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 323, 324, 148, 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') (Sections 307, 427, 120-B of the IPC added later on), at Police Station Dharamgarh, District Sangrur.

2. The gravamen of the allegations against the petitioner is that on 17.07.2023, Rajwinder Singh along with his brother Kala Singh had gone out in a car bearing registration number PB-08AK-4281 in connection with some domestic work. After completing the work, when they returned and reached the main gate of their house at about 5:30 p.m., the complainant (Balvir Kaur) went to open the gate. At that time, Rajwinder Singh @ Raju was driving the car, and Kala Singh was seated beside him in the front passenger seat. It has been

CRM-M-13435-2025

alleged that all of a sudden, Gurtej Singh, Kulwinder Singh @ Sunny, Gurwinder Singh, Happy, Bantu, along with 5–6 unidentified persons, armed with sharp-edged weapons such as swords and *kirches*, attacked Rajwinder Singh @ Raju and Kala Singh. The assailants forcibly dragged both victims out of the car and inflicted multiple injuries on their persons, as a result of which profuse bleeding started from their bodies. Upon the complainant raising an alarm, nearby people gathered at the spot, whereupon the assailants fled from the scene. The injured Rajwinder Singh and Kala Singh were immediately taken to the hospital; however, Kala Singh succumbed to his injuries on the way, while Rajwinder Singh @ Raju was referred to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala for further treatment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 18.07.2023. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner is not attributed any specific role to the deceased, but is stated to have caused injury to PW-Kala Singh only. Learned counsel has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question on account of his being part of unlawful assembly, which is doubtful. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has suffered custody for more than 02 years and 03 months, & is not shown to be involved in any other case. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record the custody certificate dated 26.10.2025, in the Court today, which is taken on record.

4.1. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of regular bail to the petitioner by arguing that there are direct/ clear

CRM-M-13435-2025

allegations against the petitioner. Learned counsel has further argued that in case, the petitioner is extended the concession of regular bail, there is all likelihood that he may flee from the process of justice and also interference with the prosecution evidence. Thus, dismissal of the present petition is entreated for.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 18.07.2023 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan has been presented on 12.10.2023. Out of total 21 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined till date.

At this juncture, it would be apposite to refer herein a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh vs. State of Maharashtra and anothers, 2024(3) RCR (Criminal) 494***, which reads thus:

“18. Criminals are not born out but made. The human potential in everyone is good and so, never write off any criminal as beyond redemption. This humanist fundamental is often missed when dealing with delinquents, juvenile and adult. Indeed, every saint has a past and every sinner a future. When a crime is committed, a variety of factors is responsible for making the offender commit the crime. Those factors may be social and economic, may be, the result of value erosion or parental neglect; may be, because of the stress of circumstances, or the manifestation of temptations in a milieu of affluence contrasted with indigence or other privations.

19. If the State or any prosecuting agency including the court concerned has no wherewithal to provide or protect the fundamental right of an accused to have a speedy trial as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution then the State or any other prosecuting agency should not oppose the plea for bail on the ground that the crime committed is serious. Article 21 of the Constitution applies irrespective of the nature of the crime.

20. We may hasten to add that the petitioner is still an accused; not a convict. The over-arching postulate of criminal jurisprudence that an accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty cannot be brushed aside lightly, howsoever stringent the penal law may be.

21. We are convinced that the manner in which the prosecuting agency as well as the Court have proceeded, the right of the accused to have a speedy trial could be said to have been infringed thereby violating Article 21 of the Constitution.”

It is not in dispute that private witness, namely, PW-Kala Singh (injured) and PW-Balvir Kaur (FIR-complainant) already stand examined. The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1. Indubitably, the present petition is the second attempt by the petitioner to secure regular bail. The last bail plea preferred by the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn on 29.10.2024. However, keeping in view the extended custody of the petitioner for about 01 year and there being no substantial progress in the trial, this Court is inclined to affirmatively consider the instant plea for bail. A profitable reference, in this regard, can be made to a judgment of this Court passed in ***CRA-S-2332-2023*** titled as ***Rafiq Khan versus State of Haryana and another***, relevant whereof reads as under:

“10. As an epilogue to the above discussion, the following principles emerge:

I Second/successive regular bail petition(s) filed is maintainable in law & hence such petition ought not to be rejected solely on the ground of maintainability thereof.

II. Such second/successive regular bail petition(s) is maintainable whether earlier petition was dismissed as withdrawn/dismissed as not pressed/dismissed for non-prosecution or earlier petition was dismissed on merits.

III For the second/successive regular bail petition(s) to succeed, the petitioner/applicant shall be essentially/pertinently required to show substantial change in circumstances and showing of a mere superficial or ostensible change would not suffice. The metaphoric expression of seeking second/successive bail plea(s) ought not be abstracted into literal iterations of petition(s) without substantial, effective and consequential change in circumstances.

IV No exhaustive guidelines can possibly be laid down as to what would constitute substantial change in circumstances as every case has its own unique facts/circumstance. Making such an

CRM-M-13435-2025

attempt is nothing but an utopian endeavour. Ergo, this issue is best left to the judicial wisdom and discretion of the Court dealing with such second/successive regular bail petition(s).

V In case a Court chooses to grant second/successive regular bail petition(s), cogent and lucid reasons are pertinently required to be recorded for granting such plea despite such a plea being second/successive petition(s). In other words, the cause for a Court having successfully countenanced/entertained such second/successive petition(s) ought to be readily and clearly decipherable from the said order passed.”

6.2. As per custody certificate dated 26.10.2025 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 02 years, 03 months and 04 days, & is not shown to be involved in the other FIR(s).

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the factual milieu of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed

CRM-M-13435-2025

hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.
10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

October 27, 2025
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No