



CRM-M-16558-2026

-1-

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

214

**CRM-M-16558-2026
Date of decision : 20.05.2026**

CHANJAN KUMAR ALIAS SANJU

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Abdul Aziz, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.66 dated 26.07.2025, registered under Sections 109, 351(2), 191(3), 190 & 238 of BNS, 2023 (earlier Sections 307, 506, 148, 149 & 201 IPC), at Police Station Maloud, District Khanna.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was a member of an unlawful assembly and participated in causing injuries to the complainant. It is alleged that co-accused Harjinder Singh was holding a grudge against the complainant-Ashraf. On 24.07.2025 at about 3:00 PM, when the complainant, along with his cousin Aslam and Nanak Singh, was travelling on a motorcycle, they reached near the house of Harjinder Singh. At that time, Harjinder Singh allegedly caught hold of the motorcycle handle, causing them to fall to the



CRM-M-16558-2026

-2-

ground. Thereafter, Harjinder Singh allegedly brought a sword from his house and attacked them. It is further alleged that co-accused Bindri and Beant Singh, armed with kirches, Bennu armed with a stick, and Sandeep Singh and Jatinder Singh @ Nikka also arrived at the spot and caused injuries to the complainant party. During the course of investigation, the co-accused, in their disclosure statements, named the petitioner as being involved in the alleged occurrence.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was arraigned as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. Besides the disclosure statement, there is no incriminating material qua the petitioner which would connect him with the alleged offence and no recovery has been effected from him. It is further submitted that the disclosure statements allegedly suffered by the co-accused during police custody are not admissible in evidence unless duly corroborated by independent material.

4. Learned counsel further submits that there is an inordinate delay of 02 days in lodging the FIR and no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 18 days and is not involved in any other case. Co-accused Beant Singh and Binder Singh @ Bindri have already been granted bail by this Court in CRM-M-70838-2025 and CRM-M-7828-2026 on 19.12.2025 and 16.02.2026 (Annexures P-2 & P-3 respectively). He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as none of the 14 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

5. Notice of motion.



6. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the status report by way of an affidavit of Sh. Harmanpreet Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Payal, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana and the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which are taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 18 days. He, upon instructions, submits that none of the 14 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

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

8. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 08 months and 18 days, he is not involved in any other criminal case, he was neither named in the FIR nor any specific role has been attributed to him, co-accused(s) have already been granted bail and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as none of the 14 cited prosecution witnesses 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.

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



CRM-M-16558-2026

-4-

10. 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.

May 20, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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