



CRM-M-26830-2025

-1-

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

**CRM-M-26830-2025**

Date of Decision: 10.11.2025

Rashpal Singh @ Kala

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. Anshul Sharma, Advocate  
for the petitioner (through VC).

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Complainant in person alongwith his counsel  
Mr. Pulkit Mago, Advocate.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.180 dated 16.08.2024 under Sections 333, 115(2), 191(3), 190 BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station City Phagwara, District Kapurthala.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Prem Chand. It was alleged that his daughter, namely, Ramandeep Kaur was 23 years of age, who was working in Globe Hospital, Jalandhar. On 15.08.2024 at about 10:00 p.m., he alongwith his family members were sleeping and in the meantime, someone knocked at the door. He found Rashpal Singh @ Kala (petitioner) alongwith 7-8 unknown persons duly armed and forcibly entered his house. They started manhandling him and abused him. The complainant was given multiple injuries by them. On raising alarm, Rashpal Singh @ Kaka alongwith 7-8 persons escaped from the spot. The complainant was admitted



in the Civil Hospital, Phagwara. Request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested, however, he was granted bail by learned SDJM, Phagwara vide order dated 22.08.2024. The complainant, thereafter, approached this Court by way of filing CRWP-11480-2024 praying for issuance of writ in the nature of habeas corpus. It was contended by the complainant before this Court that the petitioner had given him severe injuries and he was granted bail by concealing the facts that he was involved in other cases. This Court vide order dated 18.12.2024, cancelled the bail granted to the petitioner and he was directed to be taken in custody. Earlier the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-8033-2025 for the grant of regular bail, however, the same was allowed to be dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 24.04.2025. Hence, he has again approached this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted before this Court that the petitioner is behind the bars since the date of cancellation of his bail by this Court vide order dated 18.12.2024. He has submitted that the petitioner was already granted bail by learned SDJM, Phagwara, however, the same has been cancelled by this Court. He submits that the investigation is complete, challan has been presented and charges have been framed. He, thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Complainant is present in person in Court alongwith his counsel. However, he has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is a person of criminal nature,



who can misuse the concession of bail.

5. Learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. On instructions, he has submitted that investigation is complete and charges have been framed, however, out of total 11 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that though the petitioner was granted bail by learned trial Court, however, this Court had cancelled the same vide order dated 18.12.2024. Since then the petitioner is behind bars. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 10 months & 25 days as on 08.11.2025. As submitted before this Court, though the petitioner is involved in other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. The investigation is complete and charges have also been framed.

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 petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8.            Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
9.            However, the complainant would be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail, in case the petitioner is found to be misusing the concession of bail.

|            |                             |                   |
|------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
|            |                             | (RAJESH BHARDWAJ) |
|            |                             | JUDGE             |
| 10.11.2025 |                             |                   |
| sharmila   | Whether Speaking/Reasoned : | Yes/No            |
|            | Whether Reportable :        | Yes/No            |