



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

218

CRM-M-67252-2025
Date of decision: 05.12.2025

JASVIR SINGH @ SARTAJ

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondents

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

Present: - Mr. Vivek K. Thakur, Advocate and
Mr. Kashish Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gursher Singh Dhillon, Advocate
for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 20 dated 20.02.2023, registered under Section(s) 302, 148, 149, 506 and 427 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Khamano, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the case of the petitioner stands on identical footing with that of the co-accused who has already been extended the concession of bail by this Court

vide order dated 07.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-61273-2025 titled Jagjit Singh

@ Jagga v. State of Punjab. It is submitted that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he was holding a baseball bat and had attempted to strike the deceased; however, the deceased evaded the blow and the bat allegedly struck the windshield of the vehicle. Counsel further submits that, even if the prosecution version is accepted to be true, no injury whatsoever is attributed to the petitioner. The only act alleged against him is the breaking of the windshield, which does not connect him to the fatal injuries caused to the deceased. He also contends that the petitioner is in custody for more than 02 years and 09 months in the present case.

3. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

4. Counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant appears and files his power of attorney in the Court today and contends that the presence of the petitioner at the spot stands duly corroborated by the statement of the eye-witnesses, hence, his involvement in the act cannot be said to be non-existent.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. Without going into the merits of the controversy and taking into consideration the fact that co-accused Jagjeet Singh @ Jagga has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court after noting his period of custody of 03 years and 08 months, despite him being charged of giving fist blows, the case of the present petitioner would be on a slightly better footing. The stage of trial continues to remain exactly the same as it was when the co-accused's petition was considered. Accordingly, on the touchstone of parity and bearing in mind that the petitioner is attributed a role even lesser in gravity

than that of co-accused Jagjeet Singh @ Jagga, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. 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.

9. 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.

DECEMBER 05, 2025

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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