



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

208

CRM-M-11307-2026 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 21.05.2026.

Deepak Kumar @ Deepu @ Deep DX

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Vipan Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, Deputy Advocate General, 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	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Deepak Kumar @ Deepu @ Deep DX	232	25.10.2025	109, 115(2), 191(3), 190 (238 added later on) of BNS and 25 of Arms Act	Sadar	Kapurthala

2. Counsel for the petitioner argues that, for the alleged commission of offences forming part of the same sequence of events, two separate FIRs have been registered—one at Police Station Sadar Kapurthala and another at Police Station City Kapurthala—and both FIRs contain divergent versions. In

FIR No.232 dated 25.10.2025 (impugned herein), registered at Police Station Sadar Kapurthala, complainant alleged that on 24.10.2025, at about 10:00–11:00 A.M., when he came out of his house, accused persons, namely Ajay Gola, Vijay, Sunny Kumar alias Sunny Saga, Sanam Thapar @ Ghoda, Deepu @ DJ Wala (petitioner herein), Pawan Baanwala, and Sonu of Sultanpur Lodhi, attacked him. It is specifically alleged that accused Sunny Kumar alias Sunny Saga, was armed with a pistol and a gunshot fired by him caused injury to complainant-Rinku, who thereafter underwent medico-legal examination and petitioner allegedly gave *Dattar* blow on the thigh of the complainant and wrist of his friend Karanvir. However, both the injuries were declared simple.

In another FIR No.0384 dated 26.12.2025, registered at Police Station City Kapurthala, it is alleged that, in respect of the same incident dated 24.10.2025, a second application was moved on 26.12.2025, pursuant to which a separate FIR came to be registered. As per the said FIR, when complainant was proceeding to his duty in his I-20 car, bearing registration No.PB-07-BT-9579, the accused persons, namely Ajay @ Gola (armed with a dattar), Vijay Kumar (armed with a dattar), Arshdeep Singh @ Pawan (armed with a dattar), Sunny Kumar alias Sunny Saga, stated to be armed with a stick), and Sanam @ Gora (armed with a stick), intercepted and surrounded him. It is further alleged that petitioner raised a lalkara to teach the complainant a lesson for acting as an informant. Further submits that co-accused namely Swaran Singh @ Swarn Singh @ Sonu, Sanam Singh @ Sanam Thaper @ Ghora, Vijay Kumar and Arshdeep @ Pawan Banwala have already been released on interim anticipatory bail, vide orders dated 02.02.2025, 13.02.2025 and 19.01.2025 (Annexures P-3 to P-5 respectively), whereas co-accused Sunny Kumar @ Sunny Saga, against whom there were

allegations of firing shot, has also been released on anticipatory bail, by this Court, vide order dated 19.03.2026 (Annexure P-6). Thus, counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 20.05.2026. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper book.

Learned State counsel opposed the bail on the ground that keeping in view the nature of offence committed by the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

4. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsel.

5. Petitioner allegedly gave *Datar* blow on the thigh of the complainant and wrist of his friend Karanvir, however, both the injuries were declared simple and petitioner is inside jail for the last more than 04 months and 26 days i.e. since 21.12.2025 and conclusion of trial will consume considerable time as charges are yet to be framed, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail to the petitioner as further incarceration of the petitioner inside the jail without proving of charges would be improper.

Considering the above said circumstances in totality, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Consequently, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular 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.

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

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. **Petition stands disposed of accordingly.**

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

21.05.2026

jitender

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