



CRM-M-13558-2026

1

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

210

CRM-M-13558-2026

Decided on :20.04.2026

Harjot Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. B.S. Sewak, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in connection with FIR No. 49 dated 05.07.2024, under Sections 109, 3(5), 115(2), 304, 132, 61(2), 221, 118(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Division No.2, Ludhiana.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, two Nihangs surrounded Sandeep Thapar with their naked swords and inflicted injuries on his head, arms, and legs with the intention to kill him. The accused were allegedly calling each other by the names Jota, Saba, and Laddi.

It is submitted that the accused referred to as Jota is the present petitioner, Harjot Singh, who has filed the instant bail petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody for a period of last one year, nine months, and seven days. During the medical examination of Sandeep Thapar, a total of eight injuries were observed on his person, out of which two injuries on the

**CRM-M-13558-2026****2**

head were declared grievous in nature. It is further submitted that out of 35 prosecution witnesses, only five have been examined till date.

It is also submitted that on the previous date of hearing, i.e., 20.01.2026, matter was adjourned for recording the statements of the complainant Sukhwant Singh and injured Sandeep Thapar, who have since appeared and supported the case of the prosecution. However, the examination of the remaining prosecution witnesses is likely to take considerable time.

Learned counsel further submits that co-accused, namely Sarabjit Singh, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 18.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-40018-2025, and the case of the present petitioner stands on similar footing.

In view of the above, it is prayed that the petitioner be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the grant of bail and submits that the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature, as the injured sustained two grievous injuries on vital parts of the body, i.e., the head, inflicted with deadly weapons. It is further contended that the petitioner is also involved in other criminal cases, which reflects his criminal antecedents. Considering the seriousness of the offence, the manner of its commission, and the petitioner's conduct, it is prayed that the present petition for grant of regular bail be dismissed.

**CRM-M-13558-2026****3**

5. However, it is not the case of the prosecution, nor does it appear from the status report, that there is any specific medical opinion indicating that the injuries were dangerous to life.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book as well as the documents appended thereto.

7. Considering the period for which the petitioner is in custody, for a period of last one year and nine months, and the fact that out of a total of 35 prosecution witnesses, only 05 have been examined so far, it is evident that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case, including the completion of statements of the material prosecution witnesses, and the fact that the co-accused has already been granted the concession of bail, this Court is of the view that further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, petitioner is held entitled to the concession of regular bail.

Consequently, 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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an



CRM-M-13558-2026

4

independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

20.04.2026

Rashmi

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