



CRM-M-6189 of 2026

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

118

CRM-M-6189 of 2026
Date of Decision: 11.03.2026

Ravail Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Tarun Deora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)CRM-8013-2026

This is an application for placing on record Doctor Reports dated 12.08.2023 as Annexures P-7 & P-8.

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

Main Case

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.81 dated 27.07.2023 registered under Sections 307, 323, 324 and 34 of IPC and Sections 25, 27, 54 and 59 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Valtaha, District Tarn Taran.
2. Brief facts as per the case of the prosecution are that the petitioner along with other co-accused attacked and caused injuries to the complainant and his brother with an intention to kill them, due to some old enmity. Hence,

**CRM-M-6189 of 2026****-2-**

the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. He further submitted that the alleged occurrence took place on 26.07.2023 but the FIR in question was registered on 27.07.2023 i.e. after a delay of 01 day, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He argued that in fact, it is a case of version and cross-version wherein both the parties have received injuries. He further argued that if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, even then no specific injury has been attributed to the present petitioner and the only allegation against him is that he fired two shots and the pellets hit the head of the complainant as well as on the lips and right shoulder of Rashpal Singh. He further argued that as per medical record, the injuries attributed to the petitioner is stated to be simple in nature and thus, the same does not attract Section 307 of IPC, which has been added by the prosecution only to make the offence graver. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case and no recovery is to be effected from him. The petitioner is in custody since 15.10.2025. The investigation in this case is complete, challan stands presented but charges are yet to be framed. He submitted that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. He argued that



CRM-M-6189 of 2026

-3-

the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and he has actively participated in the crime. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is a first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 03 months; he has clean antecedents; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges are yet to be framed; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial and the same will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

11.03.2026

D.Bansal

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