

2025:PHHC:116957



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

206

CRM-M-46832-2025
Date of decision: 29.08.2025

SUKHJINDER SINGH ALIAS BABBLIPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Ms. Bhavi Kapur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case FIR No. 48 dated 19.05.2021 under Sections 307, 324, 323 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 201 of the IPC was added later on) registered at Police Station Sri Hargobindpur, District Batala.

2. Briefly summarizing, the present case arises from the Statement of complainant Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, Salesman at Rajindera Wines Group, alleging that on 14.05.2021, after closing the shop, he was assaulted in his room by Sukhjinder Singh @ Babli, Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi, & Jyoti. It is alleged that Babli inflicted three Kirch blows on his head and neck, while Gurpreet Singh struck him with a sota. On alarm being raised, the

accused fled. The complainant was taken to hospital, and on his statement the present FIR was registered. During investigation, medical records were seized, accused Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi was arrested and sota recovered on his disclosure. Jyoti was later declared innocent. The applicant-accused was arrested on 19.03.2024.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that out of the four injuries, three of them are attributed to the petitioner. She contends that the injury on the forehead has been declared as simple while other injuries have been held to be life threatening in case not treated timely. She further contends that the petitioner is in custody since 19.03.2024 and has undergone an actual custody of 01 years 05 months and 08 days. It is submitted that only 01 witness out of total 19 witnesses has been examined so far and the petitioner does not suffer from any criminal antecedents.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State on the other hand contends that the petitioner is the main accused and is directly responsible for causing the injuries attracting Section 307 of the IPC. He further submits that two others FIRs had been registered against the petitioner, however, he is not in a position to dispute that in both the FIRs the petitioner stands acquitted.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the facts noticed above and taking into consideration the actual period of custody of 01 years 05 months and 08 days undergone by the petitioner as well as bearing in mind the stage of trial wherein only 01 witness out of total 19 witnesses has been examined so far, I deem it

appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

AUGUST 29, 2025
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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