



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

CRM-M-69926-2025

Date of decision : 22.12.2025

Bhinder Singh @ Bhinder

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sukhcharan Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.74 dated 05.08.2024, under Sections 109/118(1)/115/191(3) and 351 of BNS (Section 117(2) of BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Longowal, District Sangrur, Punjab.

2. As per the facts of the case the present case was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Arshdeep Singh @ Arsh. It was alleged that on 03.08.2024, he along with his friend Gaganpreet Singh was going on a motorcycle from village Kunra to Badrukha to drop Ravi. After dropping Ravi, when they were returning, they were waylaid by Gagana @ Simranjit Singh, Kala, Dilpreet Singh @ Delhi and Harpreet Singh @ Nagg, who were duly armed. In conspiracy with each, other all of them opened attack on him. Harpreet Singh @ Nagg gave a kirpan blow on his head whereas Kala attacked with a rod on his right elbow and right wrist and others also attacked him. As he suffered various injuries, he was admitted in Civil Hospital, Sangrur. The request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation




commenced. During investigation, the complicity of the petitioner surfaced in the present case and he was arrested on 18.09.2024. The petitioner approached the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the application was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur vide order dated 01.12.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioners are before this Court by way of filing of present petitions.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the common order dated 19.08.2025, passed by this Court in **CRM-M-19088-2025 and CRM-M-24964-2025**, whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Gurdeep Singh @ Kala and Harpreet Singh @ Nagg, have been granted the concession of bail. He submits that on the basis of the parity, petitioner deserves to be granted bail as case of the petitioner is on better footing than that of the co-accused, who have already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner. He endorsed the fact that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Gurdeep Singh @ Kala and Harpreet Singh @ Nagg, who have already been granted bail by this Court. He has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the occurrence had taken place on 03.08.2024. The complicity of the petitioner was surfaced during investigation and he was arrested in the present case on 18.09.2024. As per custody certificate, petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, and 23 days as on



20.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Gurdeep Singh @ Kala and Harpreet Singh @ Nagg, have already been granted bail by this Court vide common order dated 19.08.2025 passed in **CRM-M-19088-2025 and CRM-M-24964-2025.**

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail on the basis of parti. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his 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.

7. 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.

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

22.12.2025
ps-I

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