

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

209(4 cases) CRM-M NO.13074-2025
DATE OF DECISION: 19.09.2025

Satish Kumar @ Kaka Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab Respondent

(2) CRM-M-18919-2025

Gurcharan Singh @ Bikka Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab Respondent

(3) CRM-M-47223-2024

Jagdeep Kumar @ Sumit Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab Respondent

(4) CRM-M-59461-2024

Roop Lal @ Roopa Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM HON’BLE MR.JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present Mr.Vinod Ghai, Sr.Advocate,
 with Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate and
 Mr. R.S.Bagga, Advocate,
 for the petitioner in CRM-M-13074-2025.

 Mr. B.S.Randhawa, Advocate,
 for the petitioner in CRM-M-47223-2024.

 Mr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr.Advocate,
 with Mr. Sukhcharan Singh Gill, Advocate and
 Mr. Avinash Singh, Advocate,
 for the petitioner in CRM-M-18919-2025.

 Ms. G.K.Mann, Sr.Advocate,
 with Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate,
 for the petitioner in CRM-M-59461-2024.

 Mr. G.S.Kaura, Advocate



with Mr. Rangat Joshi, Advocate,
for the complainant in all cases.

Mr.Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

H.S.GREWAL, J (ORAL)

Status report by way of affidavit of Kulbir Singh Sandhu, PPS,
Deputy Superintendent of Police, Nangal, District Rupnagar, Punjab on behalf of
respondent – State taken on record.

1. All the aforementioned Criminal Misc. Petitions filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.140 dated 13.09.2023, under Sections 302, 307, 324, 506, 148 and 149 of IPC, (Offence under Section 482, 427, 201 IPC added lateron) and Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Nangal, District Rupnagar, to the respective petitioners are being disposed of by common order as the same arise from the same FIR.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the deceased Manjinder Singh had gone on the call of his wife, who was admitted in hospital wherein Bikka and Prince attacked the complainant with sword with an intention to kill her which hit her on her right hand and these persons i.e Bikka, Prince, Kakka, Roopa, Mukesh Kumar, Ladhu and Gallu along with two unknown persons attacked her husband and they inflicted injuries on her husband's head and both ears, arms, both hands, shoulders, legs, ankles etc. which led to the death of Manjinder Singh. Bikka, Kakka, Roopa and one other person had muffled their faces and they were also carrying country made pistols. They tried to take a shot on the chest of the deceased but complainant pushed him aside and as a result thereof the arm and shoulder of the deceased were shot. It is stated that the accused persons also took away the DVR box of the CCTV cameras installed in the hospital.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner Satish Kumar @ Kakka submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The alleged recovery was a chance recovery. He further submits that



the petitioners Gurcharan Singh and Jagdeep Kumar are not involved in any other case while other cases are pending against petitioners Satish Kumar @ Kaka and Roop Lal @ Rupa. The petitioners are in custody for the last 01 year, 11 months and 29 days except petitioner Roop Lal @ Roopa who is in custody since 01 year, 09 months and 16 days. The stand stated to be taken is that the said Manjinder had committed the murder of Prince brother of Bikka and was on bail and consequently the present occurrence took place. It is also argued that there is no fire arm injury found on the deceased which falsifies the ocular account as stated by the complainant. The similar contentions were raised by the counsel for other petitioners.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioners. He has filed the custody certificates dated 18.09.2025 of the petitioners in the Court today and the same are taken on record. As per which, the petitioners are in custody since 01 year 11 months and 29 days while petitioner Roop Lal @ Roopa is in custody since 01 year, 09 months and 16 days. He has not disputed the fact about involvement of the petitioners in any other case. He further submits that out of total 31 witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far.

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

6. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the petitioners are in custody for the last 01 year 11 months and 29 days while petitioner Roop Lal @ Roopa is in custody for the last 01 year, 09 months and 16 days and out of total 31 witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far, all the petitioners have undergone a period of two years as of today and considering that the petitioners have undergone two years and the

fact that trial is proceeding at a very slow pace, it is also noted that the complainant has been examined after a long gap after being issued bailable warrants by the Court to depose against the petitioners and the delay has been on account of the prosecution, the continuous detention of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice. Moreover, bail is a rule and jail is an exception, therefore this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners during the pendency of the trial.

7. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, all the four petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the applicants are found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of their bail.

9. A photocopy of the order be placed on the files of connected petitions.

19.09.2025
mamta

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No