



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-51763-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 27.10.2025

Jasvir Singh @ Sanjay

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. P.S. Paul, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Dhillon, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in FIR bearing No.20 dated 20.02.2023, registered under Section(s) 302, 148, 149, 506 and 427 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Khamano, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. Vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant has been filed today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the present case pertains to an incident of road rage wherein certain assailants stated to have followed Baljit Singh (since deceased) and thereafter caused injuries. He contends that the deceased passed away as a result of head injuries sustained which are attributed to co-accused/Malagar Singh @ Balla and Inderjit Singh @ Kaka. He contends that in the initial version, the petitioner was



neither named nor any injury was attributed to him. A supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded after 05 days of the incident wherein only the name of the petitioner was mentioned but no injury was attributed to him. He contends that after completion of investigation, the challan was filed. During the course of recording of testimony, PW-1/Bachatar Singh (brother of the deceased) got his statement recorded wherein for the first time he attributed fist and kick blows to the petitioner on the face of the deceased. He contends that the aforesaid allegation has been levelled solely to explain the injuries No.3 and 4, which are pertaining to left black eye and right black eye. It is submitted that the aforesaid version has come forth after a period of more than one year of the alleged incident and that the said injury could also be a result of hematoma due to injuries No.1 and 2. It is contended that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case and he has undergone an actual custody of more than 02 years 07 months and 27 days. He contends that during the course of investigation, co-accused/Inderjit Singh @ Kaka was found innocent. After the testimony of PW-1/complainant, an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C. was moved whereupon three persons including co-accused/Malagar Singh @ Balla was summoned to face the trial. He thus contends that the evidence is to be recorded afresh with respect to all the accused. It is contended that as many as 32 prosecution witnesses have been cited and conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. However, learned counsel for the complainant contends that the



petitioner had entered into a scuffle with the eye witnesses and that he has also been identified by 04 other eye-witnesses who were present at the spot. He contends that the petitioner ran away from the spot and was later on arrested. He submits that the bail petition of the co-accused was withdrawn in the month of May-2025. It is however not disputed by him that co-accused/Malagar Singh @ Balla has been nominated as an accused on 11.09.2025 i.e. after the dismissal of the application and that the evidence is to be recorded afresh. He further contends that the petitioner has been identified by the complainant from the CCTV footage as well, the presence of the petitioner thus remains undisputed.

5. Moreover, the dismissal of the bail petition of co-accused nearly 06 months prior to the present petition would not *ipso facto* have a bearing on the facts of the present case.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and taking into consideration the facts as noticed above, the age of the petitioner (26 years), lack of criminal antecedents of the petitioner, nature of attribution to the petitioner, the stage of the trial as well as the custody already undergone by the petitioner and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.



211 CRM-M-51763-2025 (O&M)

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

27.10.2025
Mangal Singh

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