



234+231 (2 cases)
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CRM-M-35256-2025

Sukhdev Singh Gill @ PappaPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

2. CRM-M-28404-2025

Vikramjit Singh @ VickyPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

Date of decision : 06.11.2025

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Amol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Gagandeep Singh Virk, Advocate and
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-35256-2025.

Mr. Amit Agnihotri, Advocate (through V.C.)
Ms. Mani Makkar, Advocate and
Mr. Abhishek Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-28404-2025.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Sudhir Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Mandeep Kaushik, Advocate for the complainant
in CRM-M-35256-2025.

Mr. G.B.S. Dhillon, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Jagdeep Singh Bajwa, Advocate for the complainant
in CRM-M-28404-2025.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of



abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR, which is of version and cross-version.

2. Petitioner-Sukhdev Singh Gill @ Pappa has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.132 dated 11.12.2024, under Sections 109 & 3(5) of BNS and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act (Sections 103, 351(2), 61(2) of BNS, added lateron), registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Kulwinder Singh @ Kinda at Police Station Meharban, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana. Whereas petitioner-Vikramjit Singh @ Vicky has approached this Court for grant of regular bail in cross-case registered vide DDR No.20 dated 15.12.2024, under Sections 109, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sukhdev Singh Gill @ Pappa.

3. It was alleged by the complainant in the FIR that his friend Vikramjit Singh @ Vicky has visited the land to remove the electricity poles installed in the land on 11.12.2024. When Sukhjit Singh (deceased) and Karamjit Singh Sarpanch were talking, in the meantime, Sukhdev Singh Gill @ Pappa (petitioner in CRM-M-35256-2025) along with Navtej Singh @ Teji, Damanpreet Singh @ Daman, Iqbalinder Singh @ Akali, Jagtar Singh, came there and started giving abuses. He, along with Karamjit Singh and Vikramjit Singh made a request not to fight. However, all the above said persons came in fit of anger, Sukhjit Singh in order to save his life, fired 02 rounds on the ground to scare the said persons but Sukhdev Singh and his son Damanpreet, threw Sukhjit Singh on the ground. Thereafter, Sukhdev Singh Gill @ Pappa exhorted his son Damanpreet Singh not to spare Sukhjit Singh, thus, Navtej Singh @ Teji took out his pistol and fired 02 rounds from a close range on the head of



Sukhjot Singh @ Babbu. He succumbed to the injuries. The request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. As a cross version to the same, cross case was registered vide DDR No.20 dated 15.12.2024, on the statement of Sukhdev Singh Gill @ Pappa. It was alleged that it was the other side who opened and attacked on them and the allegations made against petitioner-Vikramjit Singh @ Vicky (in CRM-M-28404-2025) that he raised lalkara and gave beatings to them when he suffered injuries with the butt of the gun. On registration of the FIR and DDR, the investigation commenced. Petitioners thus, were arrested on 16.12.2024 and 01.05.2025, respectively. They approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for the grant of bail. However after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the trial Court declined the bail applications filed by all the petitioners vide orders dated 29.05.2025 & 08.05.2025, respectively. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions praying for the grant of regular bail.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner-Sukhdev Singh Gill @ Pappa (in CRM-M-35256-2025) has submitted that admittedly the case is of version and cross version. Even otherwise, the allegations made against the petitioner is that he had caught hold of the deceased and threw him on the ground. He submits that there is allegation of giving bite on the nose of the deceased, whereas the deceased succumbed to the injuries on the account of fire arm injury which is attributed to the co-accused. He submits that the complainant has already been examined and in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner thus, deserves to be granted bail.



(in CRM-M-28404-2025), who is facing prosecution in the cross-version, has submitted that the only allegation made against the petitioner is to the effect that he raised lalkara. He submits that even otherwise the ocular version is not medically corroborated and thus, *prima face* offence under Section 109 of BNS, is not made out. He, thus, submits that the material witness i.e. the complainant already stands examined and in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

6. Learned counsel for the both the petitioners has submitted that it is a case of version and cross version and it is matter of trial to be assessed which party was the aggressor.

7. Learned counsels for the complainant(s) have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners and have submitted that the petitioners were not only present at the time of occurrence but there are specific allegations made wherein active role had been placed by the petitioner(s). They submit that it was the other side who was the aggressor.

8. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has opposed the submissions made by the counsels for the petitioners and submits that once it is a case of version and cross version, the occurrence is virtually admitted. The petitioners had played an active role. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 32 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined till date.

9. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the case is of version and cross-version. Both parties are asserting the other party to be the aggressor. The allegations against petitioner-Sukhdev Singh Gill @ Pappa are to the effect that he threw the deceased on the ground and gave a bite blow on the nose of the deceased.



Whereas against petitioner-Vikramjit Singh @ Vicky the allegations is that he raised *lalkara*. As per custody certificate, petitioner-Sukhdev Singh @ Pappa has suffered an incarceration of 10 months and 17 days as on 04.11.2025 and petitioner-Vikramjit Singh @ Vicky has suffered an incarceration of 06 months and 03 days as on 05.11.2025. It further reflects that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents. The complainant i.e. the injured already stand examined. Out of total 32 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined till date.

10. 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.

11. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.11.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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