

2026:PHHC:037029



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

118

CRM-M-15587-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.03.2026

Sukhpreet Singh @ Sukha

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Gagandeep Kaur, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. GS Sandhu, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.181 dated 03.08.2024, registered under Sections 109(1), 118(1), 191(1), 190 BNS (118(2), 238 & 3(5) BNS added subsequently), at Police Station Model Town, District Hoshiarpur.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for 1 year, 5 months and 11 days. The allegations against the petitioner are of having caused injury on right elbow, wrist of Rajeev Kumar and on the back side of the complainant. The matter stands compromised between the parties, Annexure A5. Challan has been presented on 22.11.2024, charges have been framed on 03.02.2025 and 3 PWs have been examined-in-chief, out of 12. He is involved in two more cases, in one of which, he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificate dated 10.03.2026 filed by the learned State counsel is taken on record. As per the same, the petitioner is behind bars for 1

year, 5 months and 11 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against the petitioner are of having caused grievous injury to the complainant and Rajeev Kumar. However, she is unable to controvert with regard to stage and petitioner being on bail in another case.

5. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 affirms the factum of compromise and has no objection to the grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard.

7. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for 1 year, 5 months and 11 days; on bail in another case; challan was presented on 22.11.2024, charges stand framed on 03.02.2025 and out of 12 PWs, only 3 have been examined-in-chief, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of his right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

9. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioner will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioner will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, he is an accused, or for commission of which he is suspected of.
- (v) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioner shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioner shall furnish his address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioner shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioner.

10. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

11. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

11.03.2026

ashok

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No