



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

230

CRM-M-62639-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 13.11.2025

Sewak Singh ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Anupinder Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.133 dated 18.09.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 126, 304, 324, 191(3), 190 of BNS Act, 2023, wherein offence under Section 117(2) of BNS, 2023 was added later on, at Police Station Zira, District Ferozepur.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner is in judicial custody since 21.09.2025. It is further contended that it is a case of version and cross version; infact complainant party has caused injuries to Dilbag Singh, but police had not registered any cross version case due to political pressure. It is further contended that co-accused has already been granted anticipatory bail by the trial Court and the trial Court will take sufficient time to conclude the trial, thus, the petitoner deserves bail.
3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail petition of the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner was armed with a



CRM-M-62639-2025 (O&M) (2)

‘*datar*’ and he gave a ‘*datar*’ blow on the left elbow of the complainant. Learned State counsel prayed for dismissal of his bail petition.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 21.09.2025, the allegation qua the present petitioner is that he gave a ‘*datar*’ blow on the elbow of the complainant, which is on the non vital part of the body; co-accused has been released on anticipatory; offences are triable by Judicial Magistrate; investigation has already been completed; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

13.11.2025
Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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