



CRM-M-14049-2025

-1-

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

(1) CRM-M-14049-2025

Amritpal Singh @ Jass

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

(2) CRM-M-59642-2025

Sukhjot Singh @ Sukhjeet Singh @ Sheet @ Fauji

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

Date of Decision: 11.11.2025**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**Present: Mr.Harjap Singh, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-14049-2025.Mr. Karnail Singh Ahhi, Advocate, for the petitioner
in CRM-M-59642-2025.

Ms.Alisha Soni, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. This order will dispose of above-mentioned two petitions, as both have arisen out of a common FIR.

2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.55 dated 03.08.2024, under Sections 109, 121(1), 351(2), 132, 221, 191(3) and 190 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Verka, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

3. Succinctly, the facts of the present case are that the present FIR was registered on the statement of Inspector/SHO Amanjot Kaur. It was alleged that on 02.08.2024 at about 10:30/11:00 p.m., they got a secret information that 14-15 persons were standing near petrol pump Mudhal Liquor Vend, who were carrying *datar* and other deadly weapons and they



were quarrelling with each other. On receiving the secret information, the complainant along with police party reached at the place of occurrence and found commotion there. On raising the questions, the persons started fighting and got enraged and opened attack on the police party. Sukhjit Singh @ Seet @ Fauji (petitioner in CRM-M-59642-2024) was armed with *datar* and gave *datar* blow with an intention to kill them. Sajan also gave a *datar* blow to them. Amritpal Singh @ Jass (petitioner in CRM-M-14049-2025) gave blows of the iron pulley by swirling it, which he was holding. Other accused also gave kick and leg blows to the police party. Thereafter, all the persons escaped. Thus, FIR was registered for taking legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, the investigation commenced. During investigation, the petitioners were arrested on 09.10.2024/03.08.2024. Both the petitioners approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined their bail applications vide orders dated 15.01.2025 and 05.11.2024, respectively. Hence being aggrieved, petitioners are before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petitions.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that petitioner Sukhjit Singh @ Sukhjeet Singh @ Sheet @ Fauji has been alleged to have given *datar* blow, whereas, petitioner Amritpal Singh @ Jass has been alleged to have given iron rod blow. However, they have submitted that the injuries attributed to the petitioners, were declared simple. It is further submitted that co-accused Sajan had



caused injuries falling under Section 109 BNS, but he has been declared innocent. They submit that the petitioners are behind the bars from last more than one year and the prosecution witnesses are intentionally not appearing before the trial Court to prolong their incarceration. They submits that both the petitioners were falsely implicated in another FIR, which was registered on the very same day i.e. 03.08.2024, however, they are on bail in the same. They have further submitted that co-accused Samitar Singh @ Bobby and Bachittar Singh @ Ghugi have already been enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 12.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-37731-2025. They have, thus, submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. She submits that the petitioners were specifically named in the FIR. She has submitted that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioners that they had inflicted number of injuries with *datar* and iron rod on the police party. On instructions, she submits that challan has been presented and charges have been framed, however, out of total 28 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined. She has placed on record the custody certificates of the petitioners.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that though the petitioners were named in the FIR, however, the injuries attributed to them were found to be simple. Custody certificates of the petitioners would show that petitioner Amritpal Singh @ Jass has suffered incarceration of 01 year and 30 days as on 10.11.2025, whereas,



CRM-M-14049-2025

-4-

petitioner Sukhjot Singh @ Sukhjeet Singh @ Sheet @ Fauji has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 02 months and 30 days as on 10.11.2025. It further shows that the petitioners are involved in one more case. Admittedly, co-accused in the present case have already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 12.09.2025.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. It is being clarified that in case the petitioners do not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, their custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

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

11.11.2025

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No