



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51961-2025

Reserved on: 13th November, 2025

Pronounced on: 20th November, 2025

Kohinoor Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. G.S. Nahel, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Vivek Singla, Advocate for the complainant.

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. 30 dated 03.04.2025 registered under Sections 103, 190, 191(3), 61(2) and 238 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Longowal, District Sangrur.

2. Adumbrated facts as emanating from the record are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by the complainant Bhagat Singh on 03.04.2025, alleging that on the same day he, along with his brother-in-law Kulwinder Singh, had gone to village Longowal. His elder son, Mandeep Singh, had also gone there to meet his friends. At about 4:00 PM, when his son along with his friends Talwinder Singh and Atarjot Singh was present near SLIET College, some youths intercepted him and opened an assault upon him by causing injuries with



weapons which they were carrying. The present petitioner was one amongst them and 6–7 persons were unknown to the complainant. The injured was rushed to the hospital but was declared to be brought dead.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Post-mortem examination of the dead body of Mandeep Singh and inquest proceedings were conducted. The complainant recorded a supplementary statement on 05.04.2025, on the basis of which, 05 persons were nominated as additional accused.

4. As per the further allegations, it transpired during investigation that there were two rival groups in Akal Degree College, Mastuana Sahib, who were fighting over presidentship in the college. One of them belonged to the group of Harman Singh Kara, whereas the other belonged to the faction of Rampreet Singh. The victim belonged to the latter's faction. It was also revealed that on the same day, the members of the group of Rampreet Singh had opened an attack upon Rajbir Singh Bacha and the petitioner, who were injured and were admitted to Civil Hospital, Sangrur. The petitioner gave his Alto car bearing registration number PB-03-AZ-1359 to Rajbir Singh, who, along with his accomplices, by riding in two cars, had gone to the place of occurrence and had inflicted injuries upon the victim with deadly weapons, thereby causing his death by forming membership of an unlawful assembly. The petitioner, who was admitted in the hospital, was arrested on 05.04.2025. The car belonging to him was recovered from the custody of co-accused Rajbir Singh. The other accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed, and the petitioner, along with the co-accused, is facing trial for commission of the aforementioned offences.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has



been falsely implicated in this case. He was not present at the spot at the time of occurrence as he had been admitted in Civil Hospital, Sangrur on 03.04.2025 at about 1:45 PM, and therefore there was no question of his being present at the spot. It was he who had sustained injuries at the hands of members of the group of the deceased, and DDR No. 22 dated 04.04.2025, on the basis of which subsequently FIR No. 34 dated 16.04.2025, was registered against the members of the rival group. He had no motive to cause death of the victim. He was not named by the eyewitnesses Talwinder Singh and Atarjot Singh. The prosecution version is inconsistent. No specific act has been attributed to him. No recovery has been effected at his instance. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. He has clean antecedents. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has vehemently argued that the petitioner hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused and, in pursuance thereof, the co-accused formed membership of an unlawful assembly with each other and opened an attack upon the victim, who sustained fatal injuries and had succumbed to the same. The car of the petitioner was used in the occurrence and it has been recovered at the instance of the co-accused. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. There are chances of the petitioner's intimidating them or committing similar offences if extended the benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

8. The petitioner, who allegedly belonged to a rival group in the



college, is stated to have hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused after sustaining injuries at the hands of the members of the rival group, and as per the prosecution case, the co-accused by forming membership of an unlawful assembly had killed the victim. The petitioner was admittedly not present at the spot at the time of the occurrence. However, his vehicle is stated to have been used at that time. The petitioner was admittedly admitted in Civil Hospital, Sangrur at the time when the occurrence allegedly took place. A cross-DDR and then FIR No. 34 had been registered. The car of the petitioner had been used at the time of the occurrence. The allegations *prima facie* show the complicity of the petitioner in the crime by way of hatching conspiracy. The allegations against the petitioner are specific in nature. Keeping in view the above discussed facts, the gravity of the allegations, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be given benefit of bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

20th November, 2025
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |