



134+231

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

CRM-M-61570-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 22.12.2025

Nardev Singh @ Bobby Mann

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. R.S. Rai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate,
Mr. Rehan Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. A.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Walia, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Varun Sharma, Advocate, Ms. Sandhya Gaur, Advocate,
Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. Hunarveer Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**CRM-44770-2025 and CRM-51385-2025**

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.142 dated 05.10.2024, under Section 109, 115(2), 351(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS and Section 25 & 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Jalalabad, Fazilka.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the present case are that the FIR in question had been registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Gurpreet Singh son of Beant Singh, who had alleged that he is a worker of Aam Aadmi Party and had filed his nomination paper for contesting election of Sarpanch of his village with the Returning Officer, Jalalabad.

His Chacha (uncle) Shaminder Singh was along with him. Harpinder



Singh son of Vardev Singh, who belongs to the opposite political party, Akali Dal, has also filed his nomination paper for the post of Sarpanch. He along with his Chacha, (Ex.-Sarpanch Shaminder Singh) had come to the office of the BDPO, Jalalabad for filing the nomination paper. Mandeep Singh, who was a party worker, was also present in the office at that time and had filed his nomination paper for the post of Sarpanch of village Chak Mohammade Wala. At about 4.30 p.m., Vardev Singh @ Noni Mann and Nardev Singh @ Bobby Mann (present petitioner), Harpinder Singh son of Vardev Singh, Harman Singh, Balraj Singh along with 15-20 unknown persons, who could be identified by him, were already present in the office of the BDPO. He produced objections on the nomination paper of Harpinder Singh on the ground that he was in illegal possession of the panchayat land of village Chak Suhele Wala and had set up his private office on the panchayat land as well as their private school in the name of Mata Gujri Public School is also established on this land. Hence, the NOC of the said school had already been cancelled by the State of Punjab and the recognition/affiliation granted by the CBSE was also cancelled. The said cancellation had been assailed by them before the Hon'ble High Court by way of filing two writ petitions and due to the same, Vardev Singh and Nardev Singh were nurturing a grudge against him and his Chacha Shaminder Singh. It is because of the same, all those persons started throwing brickbats on them when they reached in the office of the BDPO. When they tried to slip away from the spot, Nardev Singh @ Bobby Mann fired a shot from his revolver towards him which did not hit him. Thereafter, Vardev Singh @ Bobby Mann, with an intention to kill him, fired a shot from his revolver, however, the said fire shot did not hit him instead the bullet hit on the chest of Mandeep Singh



who was standing beside him. The assailants kept on throwing brickbats on them and while raising lalkaras (exhortation), they escaped from the place of occurrence. The complainant, with the help of his Chacha Shaminder Singh and others, shifted Mandeep Singh to Civil Hospital, Jalalabad where the doctor referred him to DMC, Ludhiana. Later on, he came to know that in this incident, Rajesh Kumar son of Tilak Raj also sustained injuries. The request was made to take legal action against all the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M No.29057 of 2025 for grant of anticipatory bail, however, the same was declined by this Court vide order dated 22.07.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 10.09.2025. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fazilka, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined to him by the trial Court vide order dated 16.10.2025 and, thus, he has approached this Court again by way of filing the present petition for grant of concession of regular bail.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been due to the political rivalry between both the sides even otherwise the allegation against the petitioner is that he fired along with his brother, however, firearm injury attributed to the petitioner did not hit anyone rather it was attributed to the co-accused i.e. his brother-Vardev Singh who had allegedly caused injury to injured Mandeep Singh. He submits that this Court had already constituted a Special Investigating Team (SIT) for investigating the present case. He further submits that the investigation is complete and challan has already been presented. He submits that the alleged injury to injured-Rajesh Kumar, is a planted one



and the same cannot be even said to have been given by a firearm. He submits that the petitioner has virtually no criminal antecedents and he is behind bars since the date of his arrest. It is submitted thus, submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the complainant, however, has opposed the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR. He submits that the petitioner was not only armed with a weapon, but he has also fired a shot as well. He submits that the injury has been caused to injured-Rajesh Kumar by the shot fired by the present petitioner. He, thus, prays for rejection of bail of the present petition.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that to constitute an offence under Section 307 of IPC, it is the intention which matters. He submits that the petitioner and co-accused, Vardev Singh @ Noni Mann, both fired shots with their respective weapons, though, the fire shot by the co-accused, Vardev Singh @ Noni Mann hit in the chest of Mandeep Singh, however, petitioner fired the shot in the public and thus, offence under Section 307 IPC is made out against the petitioner also. He submits that a Special Investigation Team (SIT) has been constituted and the challan has been presented *qua* the petitioner. He thus submits that no case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, is made out. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that this Court had entrusted investigation to Special Investigation Team (SIT) and a specific case against the petitioner that he

fired, however, the injury by the firearm in the chest of injured-Mandeep Singh is attributed to the co-accused and not to the petitioner. Admittedly, investigation is already complete qua the petitioner and the challan is also presented. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 03 months and 08 days as on 21.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned Senior counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

22.12.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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