



230+349

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CRM-M-19030-2026
Beant Singh @ PommiPetitioner
versus
State of Punjab Respondent
 2. CRM-M-4390-2026
Kala @ Mandeep @ Mandeep KumarPetitioner
versus
State of PunjabRespondent
- Date of decision: 07.05.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. N.S. Chahal, Advocate (in CRM-M-19030-2026)
Mr. A.K. Khunger, Advocate (in CRM-M-4390-2026)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.
2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of filing the present petitions praying for grant of regular bail to them in case FIR No.145 dated 03.10.2025, under Sections 109(2), 115(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 (Section 117(2) added later on), registered at Police Station Jaito, District Faridkot.
3. Succinctly, facts of the present case are that the FIR in the present case has been lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Mamta Rani. It was alleged that on 02.10.2025, she along with her son Shivam and husband Sanjay Kumar went to market to purchase grocery



articles. At around 08:00 PM, Goldyarmed with Kirpan, Goru armed with Khanda, Harish armed with iron pipe grari, Kalu armed with Kirpan. Kachhu armed with iron rod, Abhi armed with Baseball bat, Vishal Kumar armed with Baseball bat, Moti @ Hakla armed with danda, Sahil, Kala @ Mandeep Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-4390-2026) and Rohit Daddu empty handed along with 3-5 unknown persons came and on seeing them, accused Rohit @ Daddu raised lalkara to catch hold him and not let them go free. Upon which, all the aforesaid persons caused injuries with their weapons to her son with an intention to kill him. When she and her husband tried to got him free, all the aforesaid persons caused injuries to her and to her husband with their respective weapons. They raised hue and cry which attracted her brother Kishore Kumar and friend of her son namely Ashwani Kumar. Then all the aforesaid persons ran away from the spot along with their respective weapons. Thus, request was made to take legal action against against the accused. Thus, the FIR was registered. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner-Kala @ Mandeep @ Mandeep Kumar was arrested on 06.10.2025. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner-Beant Singh @ Pommi (in CRM-M-19030-2026) surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused and resultantly, he was arrested on 03.10.2025. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioners approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge/Judge, Special Court, Faridkot, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined to them vide orders dated 13.01.2026 and 12.11.2025, respectively. Being aggrieved, petitioner-Beant Singh @ Pommi (in CRM-M-19030-2026) is before this Court by way of filing the present petition. Petitioner-Kala @ Mandeep @ Mandeep Kumar (in CRM-M-4390-2026) earlier approached this Court by



way of filing CRM-M-69659-2025, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 19.12.2025. Hence, he is before this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for grant of concession of regular bail.

4. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners have been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present cases. It is submitted that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Mamta Rani. It is submitted that the alleged occurrence has taken place on 02.10.2025. It is submitted that from the bare reading of the allegations made by the complainant who is the eye-witness, petitioner-Kala @ Mandeep @ Mandeep Kumar was empty handed whereas, petitioner-Beant Singh @ Pommi was not even named in the FIR, however, he has been implicated on the basis of the disclosure statement of accused-Kala @ Mandeep @ Mandeep Kumar, which is not even an admissible evidence. It is further contended that the petitioners are simply alleged to be the part of the unlawful assembly and they caused no injury to any one. It is further contended that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents. It is submitted that the challan is presented, charges have been framed and the petitioners are behind the bars from last more than six months. It is thus, submitted that the petitioners deserve to be granted the concession of regular bail.

5. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the petitioners were the part of unlawful assembly and all of them have caused about 19 injuries. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 14 witnesses, none has been examined till date. He has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioners.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it



is deciphered that petitioner-Kala @ Mandeep @ Mandeep Kumar was said to be the part of the unlawful assembly but he was empty handed. So far petitioner-Beat Singh @ Pommi is concerned, he was not named in the FIR rather, he has been arrayed as accused, on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. Both the accused are not alleged to have caused injury but were part of the unlawful assembly. Both the petitioners were said to be unarmed and did not cause any injury to the complainant's son. As submitted, out of 14 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. Custody certificates filed by the State show that the petitioners have undergone incarceration of 06 months and 29 days as on 06.05.2026 and they have no criminal antecedents as they have never been involved in any other case.

7. The trial of the cases will take sufficiently long time. However, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present cases, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

07.05.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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