



CRM-M-16540-2026

-1-

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

217

**CRM-M-16540-2026
Date of decision : 02.04.2026**

LAKHBIR SINGH ALIAS LAKHA

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Harchand Singh Batth, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Hans, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) in case FIR No.81 dated 27.10.2024, under Sections 105, 281, 3(5) of BNS, 2023, (earlier Sections 304, 279 & 34 IPC) registered at Police Station Tarsikka, District Amritsar Rural.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was driving a tractor, while Gurjant Singh was riding a motorcycle and Warispreet Singh (deceased) was a pillion rider. It is alleged that the petitioner tried to perform a stunt by lifting the front portion of the tractor into the air. In the meantime, Gurjant Singh suddenly applied the brakes of his motorcycle, as a result of which the front portion of the tractor fell upon Warispreet Singh who suffered

**CRM-M-16540-2026****-2-**

serious injuries on his person and succumbed to the injuries on the way to hospital.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that it is a case of an accident and there is a delay of 32 hours in lodging the FIR. It is submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case, however, no motive has been attributed to him. He also submits that the petitioner is in custody since 05.05.2025. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as out of 28 cited prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

4. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He, upon instructions, submits that none out of 28 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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

6. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody since 05.05.2025, no motive has been attributed to him and that the trial is likely to take a long time as out of 28 cited prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the



CRM-M-16540-2026

-3-

satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

April 02, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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