



CRM-M-9663-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205

CRM-M-9663-2026
Decided on : 16.04.2026

Sumit Kumar @ Sumit Arora

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Jitender Singh Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sumit Kumar @ Sumit Arora, aged 38 years	61	03.04.2022	302, 323, 506, 148, 149, 120-B IPC (Section 302 IPC deleted and Section 304 IPC added later on)	Tibba	Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana, Punjab

2. Vide order dated 18.03.2026, a direction was issued for recording of statement of complainant-Deepak Kumar before the trial Court.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that complainant-Deepak Kumar has already been examined and said fact is endorsed to be correct by learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Kamaljit Singh.
4. Without arguing much learned counsel for the petitioner contends that



the bail petition of one of the main accused-Paramjit Singh @ Pamma (CRM-M-22369-2025) was dismissed by this Court on 17.09.2025 by recording as under:

2. From the allegations in the FIR, it is apparent that the man who was beaten and killed on the spot was in a helpless condition, having been brutally attacked by a number of individuals. FIR, based on an eyewitness account, alleges that the accused, Sumit Arora, with the intention to kill, struck the deceased on the head with a wooden stick. In the meantime, Paramjit Singh @ Pamma (petitioner herein), Ranjit Bajaj grabbed the deceased by the arm and forcefully hit him on the pavement and threw him down and everyone started hitting him with the kick blows while laying on the ground. Resultantly Mangat Ram (deceased) fainted and died on the spot.

Injuries noticed during post mortem examination are as under:

Examination of External Injuries			
Sr. No.	Injuries	Marked	Injury Number
1.	A reddish Abrasion of Size MS 2 cm x 1 cm on back of left elbow	Yes	2
2.	A Reddish contusion MS 2 cm x 1 cm on inner aspect of right cheek and outer aspect of the right nostril	Yes	3
3.	Diffuse Contusion over left parieto occipital region. ON dissection extra cranial Hemorrhage present with fresh oozing of blood is noticed through saggital suture posteriorly. On opening the skull extra dural and sub dural Hemorrhage present over left pariental and left occipital areas of brain. Intra cerebral Hemorrhage present at places, CSF Blood stained on removal of brain clotted blood present.	Yes	1

Learned counsel submits that whether the injuries are corroborated by the oral testimony of the eyewitness is a matter to be decided by the learned Trial Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to the deposition of Pinki, daughter of the deceased Mangat Ram, who appeared as PW2, and submits that the instant case was registered against the petitioner due to the intervention of certain politicians. For this purpose, the counsel relies on the relevant portion of her deposition, which reads as follows:

“It is correct that Navjot Singh Sidhu, a renowned politician, and Sanjay Talwar, the area MLA, came to Ludhiana after the occurrence and supported us in lodging the FIR and securing the arrest of the accused.”

Mr. D.S. Matya, Advocate, further contends that because of intervention of politicians, petitioner has been implicated in the present case.

4. Whereas, this Court draws another impression on a prima facie basis is



that the deceased and complainant were in a helpless situation, and that the criminal case was registered due to the intervention of certain individuals. However, whether the present petitioner was involved or not cannot be determined at this stage of the proceedings.

5. *This Court finds no reason to grant bail to the petitioner, as the eyewitness account has been duly corroborated. In the light of the facts and circumstances stated above, I do not find any merit in the present petition. Accordingly, petition is hereby dismissed.*

However, prosecution and learned trial Court are directed to expedite the trial proceedings in accordance with law and conclude the same preferably within a period of eight months from today.

Let copy of this order be forwarded to trial Court concerned for information and necessary compliance.”

5. Further argues that said order was assailed by the co-accused Paramjit Singh @ Pamma before the Hon'ble Apex Court vide Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No. 18675-2025 and after considering the circumstances in its entirety, co-accused-Paramjit Singh @ Pamma was granted bail by the Apex Court vide order dated 21.01.2026 by recording as under:-

“1. Leave granted.

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

3. This appeal impugns an order dated 17.09.2025 passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh rejecting the regular bail prayer of the appellant in connection with First Information Report No.61 of 2022, registered at Police Station Tibba, District Ludhiana.

4. The submission of the learned counsel for the appellant is that nine named accused including the appellant along with one unknown person were implicated wherein specific role was ascribed to co-accused Sumit Arora of using a wooden stick to assault the deceased. As regards the present appellant, it is alleged that he along with co-accused Ranjit Bajaj grabbed the deceased by his hand and hit his head on the pavement. It is submitted that admittedly no weapons are alleged to have been used by the appellant or the other co-accused except Sumit Arora, who is stated to have used a wooden stick. It is submitted that there is political rivalry relating to control of a temple. It has also been submitted that by now the appellant has nearly served three years and nine months in jail pending trial, and the trial is not likely to conclude soon as out of 25 witnesses only 4 have been examined thus far. It has also been contended that the appellant has no previous criminal antecedents.

5. The learned counsel for the respondent has opposed the prayer for bail but could not dispute that the appellant by now has served nearly three years and nine months in jail pending trial and that there are no previous criminal antecedents of the appellant.



6. Having regard to the nature of the allegations and the period of pending trial incarceration, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the prosecution case, we are of the view that the appellant is entitled to be released on bail at this stage, pending trial.

7. The appeal is, accordingly, allowed. The order passed by the High Court rejecting the bail prayer of the appellant is set aside.

8. The appellant shall be released on bail on such terms and conditions as the trial court may deem fit to impose in the facts and circumstances of the case.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of."

6. In view of the undisputed position as explained by the petitioner's counsel with the help of the orders passed by both the Courts (High Court and Hon'ble Apex Court), I find that there is no reason with this Court to deny the concession of bail. Accordingly, prayer made in the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 16, 2026

reena

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