



234

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35750-2025

Date of decision : 09.09.2025

Jangir Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Tajinder Pal Singh Makkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present third petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.0020 dated 03.05.2024, under Sections 326, 324, 323, 341, 148 & 149 of IPC, registered at Police Station Lakhewali, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. As per the facts of the case, the FIR case was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Tejveer Singh. It was alleged that on 02.05.2024 at about 11:00 pm when he was going to his house from Sri Muktsar Sahib, then accused Jojo Singh armed with Toka, Manak Singh armed with Kapa, Tesa Singh armed with sword, Jangri Singh (present petitioner) armed with handle of spade, along with other accused, waylaid him. Jangir Singh raised *lalkara* to catch hold of him. He got perplexed and ran away from there, however, he was chased by all the accused. All of them encircled him and started beating him. Jojo Singh gave *toka* blow



on his head, Vishal Singh gave sword blow on his right arm and Jangir Singh (petitioner) who was armed with the handle of spade, gave a blow of the same on his head. The other unidentified persons also caused injuries to him. On hearing the commotion, his mother and others reached the place of occurrence and he was shifted to Civil Hospital. Thus, the request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced and the petitioner was arrested on 13.05.2024. He approached the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 23.07.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing of CRM-M-38660-2024 and CRM-M-3686-2024, however, the first one was dismissed vide order dated 05.12.2024 and the second petition was withdrawn vide order dated 07.02.2025. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present third petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is a senior citizen, aged 71 years, who has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the complainant himself is facing prosecution in one more case under the NDPS Act. He submits that the house of the petitioner was put on fire by the complainant's side and regarding this occurrence there is a cross-version as well. He submits that it was the complainant's side who was aggressor, however, the petitioner was falsely roped in the present case. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the cross-examination of the complainant-injured, wherein the complainant has deposed that he did not remember whether Jangir Singh had caused any injury to him. He submits that the false implication of the



petitioner is writ large. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 01 years but there is no material progress in the trial. It is submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and thus, he deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner was not only specifically named in the FIR but he had caused head injury to the injured. It is submitted that the injured suffered in all 19 injuries. She, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, 13 witnesses still remains to be examined. She has affirmed that it is a case of version and cross-version. She has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the present case is of version and cross-version. The complainant's side is facing prosecution in a cross version i.e. DDR No.12 dated 05.05.2024. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 03 months and 26 days as on 08.09.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. As submitted before this Court, out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, 13 witnesses still remains to be examined.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, 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. 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

09.09.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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