

**CRM-M-40242-2025**

1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****218****CRM-M-40242-2025****Date of decision : 11.09.2025**

Tejinder Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Randhir Singh Thind, Advocate,
Mr. Bhrigu Agnihotri, Advocate and
Mr. Jagdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 191(3), 324(4), 125, and 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959, the FIR No.57 dated 01.04.2025 has been recorded in Police Station Division-6, District Ludhiana. With regard to commission of abovementioned offence, the petitioner has been arrested. He is in custody since 21.06.2025, and therefore, craving for bail.

2. Learned State Counsel has filed reply to the petition as well as custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

**CRM-M-40242-2025**

2

3. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the abovementioned FIR came into being on the statement of Jaswinder Singh. According to complainant, one of the accused, namely Jagjot Singh @Badshah, the son of the present petitioner, was his friend, and that otherwise also, their families were known to each other. According to complainant, about one year ago, some differences had cropped-up between him and Jagjot Singh @Badshah, and therefore, their relations were estranged. As per complainant, in the backdrop of abovementioned facts, on 31.03.2025 at about 10:15-10:30 pm, his car was intercepted by three sons of the petitioner and at that time, they were also accompanied with two more persons, namely Deep Khera and Bawa Singh. According to complainant, thereafter, they had thrashed the complainant. As per complainant, abovenamed accused, namely Jagjot Singh @Badshah, had fired a gunshot also, which injured on the knee of the complainant.

4. Heard.

5. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that after three months of incident, on the basis of supplementary statement of injured, the name of petitioner has been introduced. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that major role attributed to him is for conspiring with the main accused and facilitating the attack.

6. Learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. In the reply filed by the State, it has specifically been mentioned

**CRM-M-40242-2025**

3

that in addition to role of conspiracy and facilitation, the petitioner himself was also present on the spot, and instrumental in causing injury on the person of petitioner. According to learned State Counsel, since major role has been attributed to the petitioner and injury caused to the complainant is grievous in nature, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, there are certain relevant aspects which needs to be taken into consideration, before arriving at any decision with regard to present bail application. Those factors are: -

- a) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of 2 months and 20 days;
- b) that injured has already been discharged from the hospital;
- c) that name of the petitioner did not figure in the FIR;
- d) that any injury has not been specifically attributed to the petitioner;
- e) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- f) that investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future; and
- g) that detention of the petitioner in judicial lockup is not likely to serve any purpose.



CRM-M-40242-2025

9. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to the conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

10. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby allowed. Hence, petitioner is hereby admitted to bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of learned Area Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

SEPTEMBER 11, 2025
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No