

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

2026.PHHC.054480



CRM-M-17654-2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 08.04.2026

**SHINDA SINGH ALIAS CHHINDA SINGH ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... RESPONDENT**

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

Present:- Mr. I.S.Khara, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (Section 439 Cr.P.C.) in FIR No.106 dated 16.11.2024, U/s 109, 118(1), 115(2), 126(2), 191(3), 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, (Erstwhile sections 307, 324, 323, 341, 148, 149 of IPC), and later on added Section 118(2) B.N.S. (Erstwhile section 326 IPC), registered at Police Station Balianwali, District Bathinda, Punjab.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the FIR was registered on the statement of Mewa Singh to the effect that on 15.11.2024 when his younger son Muskan Singh alias Bobby along-with his friends were going on his motorcycle from Village Khokhar via Mandi Kalan towards Rampura and when they reached on the canal bridge, then petitioner along with his co-accused armed with deadly weapons way laid them and inflicted grievous injuries on the person of Muskan Singh alias Bobby and his friends.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. All the injuries

were collectively declared to be dangerous to life, however, no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 06 months and 23 days and is not involved in any other case. He, thus, prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and for the complainant vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. He further submits that as per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 06 months and 23 days.

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

7. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner; the petitioner is in custody for the last 06 months and 23 days; he is not involved in any other case; trial of the case is yet to commence and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Reference can be made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Pardeep Kumar @ Banu versus State of Punjab*, bearing Criminal Appeal No.1341/2026 (arising out of SLP(Cri.) No.18775/2025), decided on 13.03.2026, wherein it has been categorically held that where the accused has remained in custody for a considerable

period and the trial has not even commenced, or is not likely to conclude in the near future, therefore, continued incarceration would amount to punishment without trial. In such circumstances, further detention pending trial is not necessary and the accused is entitled to be released on bail.

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 trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

08.04.2026
Janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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