



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

**CRM-M No.12427 of 2026
Date of decision: 18.05.2026**

Naib Singh @ Naibi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S. SHEKHAWAT

Present :- Mr. Karan Vir Nanda, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, Asstt. AG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

N.S. SHEKHAWAT, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.96 dated 13.08.2025, under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 351(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS {corresponding Sections 341, 323, 506, 148, 149 IPC}, registered at Police Station Cheema, District Sangrur wherein Sections 109 and 333 BNS (corresponding Sections 307 & 452 IPC) are stated to have been added later-on.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case and the offences under Sections 109 and 333 BNS, 2023 were added later on just to make the offence graver. In fact, all the nine injuries suffered by the complainant were simple in nature and the offence under Section 109 BNS, 2023 had been wrongly added by the police. He further contends that the petitioner



was arrested on 21.08.2025 and is in custody for the last about eight months. Apart from that, the complainant was, initially, admitted on 12.08.2025, however he was again admitted on 13.08.2025 without any justification. The injured has now been discharged from the hospital. Apart from that out of total 20 witnesses, none has been examined so far and the hearing of the appeal is likely to take time.

3. On the other hand, status report, filed by learned State counsel (by way of the affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Sunam, Udham Singh Wala, District Sangrur in the Court today, is taken on record. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, there is no dispute that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital and is hale and hearty. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last eight months and the trial is yet to commence against the petitioner.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, 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.

18.05.2026
seema

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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