



CRM-M-65521-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-65521-2025

Date of Decision: 27.11.2025

Jaspal Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.240 dated 09.09.2023 under Sections 302/120-B/34 IPC registered at Police Station Jandiala, Amritsar.
2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Heera Singh. It was alleged that on 09.09.2023, at about 7/7:30 p.m., when he was at home, his son, namely, Dilsher Singh @ Shera and daughter, namely, Mandeep Kaur went to Medical Store to get the medicine, on foot. Thereafter, his daughter came running home and told him that Harjeet Singh @ Jeeta, Jaspal Singh @ Ghai (petitioner) and Kuldeep Singh @ Bheeta attacked Dilsher Singh and had beaten him. On hearing, he rushed to the spot and saw that Harjeet Singh @ Jeeta had taken out Shri Sahib (small kirpan) from his Gatra and was hitting his son Dilsher Singh and Jaspal Singh @ Ghai was holding his hair and Kuldeep Singh @ Jeeta was holding both his legs and Harpreet Singh @ Dharminder Singh exhorted them not to leave him alive. Thereafter, the complainant and his younger son Dildar Singh shifted his injured son Dilsher Singh to Shri Guru Ramdass Cancer Hospital, Vallah,



Amritsar, where he died during the treatment. The motive behind the incident was that the assailants suspected his son Dilsher Singh had illicit relations with wife of Harjit Singh @ Jeeta. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On the basis of the allegations made, the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 10.09.2023. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 11.03.2024. Earlier the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-59452-2024, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn on 24.04.2025. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Kuldeep Singh @ Bheeta @ Pritam Singh. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 26.08.2025, passed in **CRM-M-45704-2024**, whereby, co-accused Kuldeep Singh @ Bheeta @ Pritam Singh has been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 10.09.2023. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the



CRM-M-65521-2025

-3-

petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Kuldeep Singh @ Bheeta @ Pritam Singh. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 10.09.2023. Co-accused, namely, Kuldeep Singh @ Bheeta @ Pritam Singh is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 02 months & 13 days as on 26.11.2025. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

27.11.2025
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No