



220

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

**CRM-M No.5049 of 2026
Date of Decision: 29.04.2026**

Baljinder Singh @ Bindu and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. J. K. Singla, Advocate and
Ms. Suman Rani, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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

Mr. Pardeep Kumar, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.199, dated 15.11.2024, under Section 109, 118(1), 3(5) of BNS, registered at Police Station Sardulgarh, District Mansa.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Kuldeep Singh @ Deep. It was alleged that the complainant was working as Hair Dresser at Sardulgarh. His sister, namely, Sandeep Kaur was married with one Himmat Singh, whose father and mother



had expired and due to the said reason, his brother-in-law, namely, Himmat Singh and his sister, namely, Sandeep Kaur are residing with the complainant on rent at village Jhanda Kalan. The complainant was constructing his house and because of this, he hired Balwinder Singh @ Bindi and Dharampreet Singh @ Dhammi (present petitioners) as labourers @ Rs.450/- per day. They both had taken Rs.5000/- as advance from the complainant and thereafter, they had not come for work. It was alleged that on 14.11.2024, when the complainant and his brother-in-law were going to the house of Balwinder Singh @ Bindi, they saw that Balwinder Singh @ Bindi armed with Gandassi and Dharampreet Singh @ Dhammi armed with Khapra were standing on the street. Balwinder Singh @ Bindi raised lalkara and stated that lesson be taught to the complainant and his brother-in-law, namely, Himmat Singh. Dharampreet Singh @ Dhammi gave Khapra blow towards Himmat Singh with intention to kill which hit on his forehead and on account of the same, he fell down on the street. Balwinder Singh @ Bindi also gave *Gandassi* blow, which hit near his left ear. On raising alarm, both of them ran away from the spot. Himmat Singh got admitted in the Government Hospital, Sardulgarh for treatment from where he referred to City Healthcare Centre, Bathinda. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against both the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, both the petitioners were arrested on 23.03.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan



was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa declined the bail application filed by the petitioners vide orders dated 26.06.2025 and 03.12.2025, respectively. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioners are before this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that admittedly the petitioners were hired by the complainant himself for the construction of the house. He has submitted that the dispute arose due to their misunderstanding and the same has been resolved. He has submitted that the petitioner, namely, Dharampreet Singh @ Dhammi is not involved in any other case, whereas the petitioner, namely, Baljinder Singh @ Bindu is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case. He has submitted that the alleged occurrence has taken place at the spur of the movement. He has submitted that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest. He has submitted that the investigation already stands complete and the charges have also been framed. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has contended that



during the pendency of the trial, the parties have settled their dispute.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the injuries alleged against the petitioners were found to be grievous in nature. He, on instructions, has submitted that the charges have been framed, however, out of total 13 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. He has produced custody certificates of both the petitioners today in the Court, which are taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners in the present case were the masons, who were hired by the complainant. The alleged occurrence has taken place on 14.11.2024. Both the counsels have submitted that after the registration of the FIR, the parties have resolved their dispute. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioners have suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 01 month and 02 days as on 27.04.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner, namely, Baljinder Singh @ Bindi is involved in 01 more case, however, he is on bail in that case, whereas the petitioner, namely, Dharampreet Singh @ Dhammi is not involved in any other case. Out of total 13 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far.

8. 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. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

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

29.04.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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