

2025:PHHC:167707



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

247

CRM-M No.66232 of 2025
Date of Decision: 02.12.2025

Inderjit Singh @ Inderjeet Singh @ Sajjan ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Kanwar Inder Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
79	13.04.2025	Model Town, District Hoshiarpur	109, 118(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) (118(2) of BNS added later on)

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by complainant Amritpal Kaur to the effect that on 13.04.2025, her husband Gurdev Singh was performing sewa in a langar which was organized by the inhabitants of Village Dagana Kala at Dera Panj Peer Sekandi. At about 2:30 PM, when her husband along with some

2025:PHHC:167707



other persons was taking rest in the verandah of Dera and she was cleaning utensils, suddenly a car bearing registration No.PB 07 CJ 1035 reached there. The petitioner along with the co-accused alighted from the said car and while coming towards her husband, the accused Navjot Singh @ Jyoti made an exhortation for teaching the husband of the complainant a lesson for arguing with him. Thereafter, the petitioner struck a blow with khanda thereby causing a deep wound on his left cheek. The accused Navjot Singh @ Jyoti hit on left hand and right shoulder of her husband by striking blows with khanda. Accused Davinder Singh took khanda from the petitioner and struck a blow on his left thigh. Her husband fell on the ground and then the petitioner and his accomplices gave kicks and fist blows to him. On clamour being raised by the complainant, the persons present there rushed for his rescue but the assailants fled away from the spot in their car. Her husband was rushed to the hospital. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Offence under Section 118(2) of BNS was added on 17.04.2025. The petitioner was arrested on 13.04.2025. The other accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The injuries that have been attributed on the person of the victim, have not been declared to be dangerous to life and as such ingredients for commission of offence under Section 109 of BNS are not made out in this case. The trial is likely to take time to conclude. The co-accused Davinder Singh and Navjot Singh @ Jyoti have been extended

2025:PHHC:167707



benefit of bail. No useful purpose is going to be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any more. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab has advance notice of the petitioner and has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. There are chances of the petitioner's intimidating the witnesses, if released on bail. Hence, It is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have also gone through the record carefully.

7. The petitioner along with co-accused is alleged to have voluntarily caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the victim with an intent to cause his death. Though the allegations make out a prima facie case for commission of subject offences against him but he is in custody since 13.04.2025. Trial would obviously take considerable time to conclude since no prosecution witness has been examined so far. The similarly situated accused Davinder Singh and Navjot Singh @ Jyoti have been extended benefit of bail. Keeping in view the nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the part specifically attributed to him, the period spent by him in custody as well as the attendant facts and circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed.

2025:PHHC:167707



furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it will be open for the prosecution to apply for cancellation of bail in case the petitioner is found involved in any other similar case in future.

8. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

02.12.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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