

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

2025:PHHC:166617



CRM-M-55923-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 01.12.2025.

RAJVEER SINGH

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. J.S. Moudgill, Advocate, and
Ms. Jasmine, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.17 dated 12.02.2025, under Section(s) 109, 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, registered at Police Station City-I Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2 As per the prosecution version, the instant FIR was lodged against Manjinder Singh, son of Parminder Singh, resident of Uppli, P.S. Sadar Sangrur; Aman Kumar, son of Mohinder Pal, resident of Dr. Ambedkar Nagar, Sangrur; Rajveer Singh, son of Darshan Singh, resident of

Kheri, P.S. Sadar Sangrur; and one unknown person. The complainant, Pushpinder Singh, son of late Darshan Singh, resident of Village Uppli, stated that he is employed at the Verka Milk Plant, while his elder brother Navdeep Singh is engaged in transport work. On 11.02.2025, Navdeep Singh had a scuffle with Manjinder Singh. The next day, on 12.02.2025 at about 11:00 a.m., Manjinder Singh called Navdeep Singh, asking him to come and settle the matter. Consequently, the complainant, along with Navdeep Singh, Sukhchain Singh, and Jagdeep Singh, went near Mittal Eye Hospital, Maharaja Ranjit Singh Market, Uppli Road, Sangrur. According to the complainant, Manjinder Singh, accompanied by 8–10 persons, confronted them. Manjinder Singh is alleged to have struck Jagdeep Singh on the head with an iron rod. He then purportedly attacked the complainant, Pushpinder Singh, with the same iron rod on his head with an intention to kill him. The complainant claims that he blocked the blow with his right hand. Aman Kumar, armed with a sword, is alleged to have attacked the complainant on the head with intent to kill. Rajveer Singh is stated to have assaulted Sukhchain Singh on the head with an iron rod, and the remaining assailants also inflicted injuries. Upon alarm being raised, the accused persons fled from the spot along with their respective weapons. The complainant further stated that Jagdeep Singh @ Happy and Sukhchain Singh were taken to Civil Hospital for treatment, while Sukhchain Singh was subsequently referred to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala, due to the severity of his injuries. On the basis of the above statement, the present FIR was registered against the named three individuals and one unknown person.

3 Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that

although the petitioner is alleged to have inflicted a grievous injury on the head of the complainant, the injury has not been opined to be dangerous to life. He further submits that, notwithstanding this, the respondent has added Section 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, which is not attracted. He further contends that the petitioner is in custody since 15.02.2025 and has undergone actual custody for a period of 09 months and 15 days. He contends that other co-accused of the petitioner namely Sikander Singh @ Sikandar Singh Nanar has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 14.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-24555-2025 and co-accused Manjinder Singh and Aman Kumar have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail which was made absolute vide order dated 28.04.2025 and 08.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-13948-2025 and CRM-M-36953-2025 respectively. He submits that evidence in the case is yet to commence and as many as 16 witnesses have been relied upon by the prosecution.

4 State counsel does not dispute the factual aspects as noticed above and also the fact that the co-accused have been granted the concession of bail.

5 Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial and bearing in mind that co-accused of the petitioner namely Sikander Singh @ Sikandar Singh Nanar has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 14.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-24555-2025 and co-accused Manjinder Singh and Aman Kumar have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail which was made absolute vide

order dated 28.04.2025 and 08.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-13948-2025 and CRM-M-36953-2025 respectively, I deem it appropriate to extend the benefit of parity to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

6 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.

7 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.

8 Since the regular bail has already been granted to the petitioner, CRM-47225-2025 filed for seeking interim regular bail is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

December 01, 2025.
raj arora

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

: Yes/No

: Yes/No