



209

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

**CRM-M No.9102 of 2026
Date of Decision: 19.05.2026**

Gagandeep @ Gagan Bansal @ Kali

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. P. S. Jammu, Advocate;
Mr. R. P. S. Jammu, Advocate;
Mr. R. K. Poonia, Advocate and
Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.108, dated 12.05.2025, under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190, 117(2), 110 of BNS, registered at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sahil Soni. It was alleged that the complainant was running an Ahata with his father in Dana Mandi, Killianwali from about 04 months. It was alleged that Amit Arora @ Shanka often comes to the Ahata and the complainant was to take Rs.4000/- from him and whenever he demanded money form



him, he made excuses. It was alleged that on 21.04.2025, in the evening, Amit Arora @ Shanka came at the Ahata of the complainant and demanded some food items from him. The complainant demanded his previous payment from him, however, Amit Arora @ Shanka became furious and gone from there by saying that I give your money today. It was alleged that after some time, Amit Arora @ Shanka armed with iron rod, Noni Arora armed with an axe, Amit Bansal armed with stick, Gagan Bansal @ Kali (petitioner) armed with iron cutter and Vikas Kumar came there. Gagan Bansal @ Kali (petitioner) raised a lalkara and told to the complainant that money will be given to you. Thereafter, Gagan Bansal @ Kali gave a blow of Kappa, which hit on the head of the complainant and the complainant received injuries on both sides of his head. Amit Bansal also gave a blow of stick, which hit on the knee of left leg of the complainant. Amit Arora @ Shanka also gave blow of iron rod, which hit on the rear side of left arm of the complainant. Noni Arora gave blow of stick, which hit on the left shoulder of the complainant. All the accused gave several beatings to the complainant. However, on raising alarm, all the accused ran away from the spot along with their respective weapons. Father of the complainant also reached at the spot and admitted the complainant in Civil Hospital, Lambi, from where he referred to Civil Hospital, Badal. He was further referred to AIMS Hospital, Bathinda for treatment. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against all the accused persons. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 12.09.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced.



The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib 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, Sri Muktsar Sahib dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 17.11.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-67513-2025, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 05.12.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner has been alleged to have given a *kappa* blow, however, the injuries suffered by the complainant was not declared to be dangerous to life. He has submitted that in all there are total 05 accused in the present case and rest of the 04 co-accused are already on bail. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 12.09.2025. He has submitted that the challan has been presented and charges have been framed, however, no prosecution witness has been examined till date. He has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the

petitioner has played an active role in the commission of offence. He has submitted that the petitioner was armed with *kappa* and gave blow of the same on the head of the complainant and the injury was declared to be grievous in nature. He, on instructions, has submitted that though the charges have been framed, however, out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner in the present case has been arrested on 12.09.2025. Rest of 04 of the co-accused are already on bail. Out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 08 months and 05 days as on 18.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

7. 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. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time.

8. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, 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.

9. 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.

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

19.05.2026

rittu

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE