



CRM-M-22974-2025

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

239

CRM-M-22974-2025

Date of decision: 5<sup>th</sup> August, 2025

Sahil Singh @ Dugga

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. S.S. Maini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 371 dated 05.10.2024 registered under Sections 140(1), 115(2), 190 and 112 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') registered at Police Station City Faridkot, District Faridkot.

2. As per the allegations, on 05.10.2024, Sukhvir Singh son of the complainant Jasveer Kaur, along with his friends Sukhpreet Singh, had gone to service station of Paras, for getting service of his motorcycle done. The petitioner- Sahil @ Dugga accompanied by the co-accused and 3-4 unknown youths reached there on motor bikes and started assaulting the son of the complainant. Thereafter, he was abducted and taken to airplane ground, where the accused- Surjit Singh and 2-3 persons unknown to the victim,



were already present. The victim was undressed by them and was extended beatings. The complainant was informed about this fact and rushed towards the spot and thereafter, the assailants fled. The victim-Sukhbir Singh was taken to hospital. He sustained as many as 27 injuries, 03 of which were declared to be grievous in nature. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 22.06.2024. He was interrogated and admitting his involvement in the subject crime. Investigation has since been completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has been in custody since long. Trial would take considerable time to conclude. It was after making due deliberations and consultations that he was named after two days of the incident since there is delay in lodging of the FIR. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. His involvement in another case cannot be considered to be a ground for denying benefit of bail to him in this case. As such, it is urged that they deserve to be released on bail.

4. Status report as well as custody certificate has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and keeping in view the gravity thereof, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail especially when he has criminal antecedents. It is, accordingly, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner by forming membership of an unlawful assembly



with the co-accused, is alleged to have assaulted the son of the complainant after abducting him. However, given the nature of the allegations, it is a debatable question as to whether, a case for commission of offences under Sections 140 and 112 of BNS has been made out or not? The petitioner is in custody since 22.06.2024. Trial would take time. The injuries as sustained by the victim have been opined to be simple in nature. No useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioners in custody anymore. His involvement in another case cannot be stated to be a ground for rejecting his prayer for release on bail. In view of the above discussed facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, it is held that the petitioner makes out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**5<sup>th</sup> August, 2025**

*Parveen Sharma*

|                               |   |          |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable         | : | Yes / No |