



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

CRM-M-36854-2025

Reserved on: 1st September, 2025

Pronounced on: 4th September, 2025

Manjit Singh @ Kala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Tejinder Kataria, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

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. 107 dated 17.10.2024 registered under Sections 109, 304, 333, 351(2), 115(2), 324, 191(3) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') (Section 238 of BNS added later on) at Police Station Kulgarhi, District Ferozepur, Punjab.

2. As per the allegations, on the evening of 12.10.2024, the petitioner along with the co-accused, who are his family members had reached in front of the gate of house of the complainant. They were under the influence of liquor and started calling bad names to the family members of the complainant and also started making exhortations. The complainant reported the matter to the village Sarpanch, elected members and the family members of the petitioner was contacted to not to commit such act in future. Then on the night of 15.10.2024, when the complainant Krishna along with



her family members was taking supper while sitting in the lobby of her house, they heard some noises. The petitioner, along with the co-accused, came outside her house armed with weapons. Thereafter, 4–5 unidentified persons, with muffled faces, entered into her house and made exhortation to teach a lesson to the complainant and her family members, and then opened an assault upon them and caused injuries. The gold neck chain of the complainant was snatched by the accused Raman and Komal. The articles kept in the household were ransacked. Clamour raised by them, attracted the neighbourers and then the assailants fled. The injured including the complainant and her husband who had sustained injuries were rushed to the hospital. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 17.12.2024. Investigation now stands concluded.

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 17.12.2024. The FIR has been lodged as a result of political vendetta. There was delay of two days in reporting the matter to the police. The injuries attributed to him are simple and non-fatal in nature. The co-accused Raman, Komal and Krishna have been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. He has clean antecedent. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not going to serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that keeping in with the gravity of the allegations as leveled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be given benefit of bail. Therefore, it is



urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed heard.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, is further alleged to have caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the complainant and her family members. One of the injuries as sustained by the injured Jagir Singh had been declared dangerous to life and the same has been attributed to the petitioner. The petitioner has been in custody since 17.12.2024. Challan has been presented but trial will take time to conclude as even charges have not been framed so far. The petitioner does not have any criminal antecedents. It is well settled proposition of law that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Keeping in view the above discussed facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that a case for release of the petitioner on bail is made out. 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

4th September, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*