



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

253

CRM-M-18033-2026

Date of decision : 09.04.2026

Date of uploading : 09.04.2026

Harmanjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus**State of Punjab**

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Gurnoor S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Baljinder Singh Sra, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.137 dated 05.12.2025 under Sections 109, 126(2), 191(3), 190, 61(2) of BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Bhindi Saidan, District Amritsar Rural.

2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

"At 1:40 PM, it is submitted that I ASI along with fellow officials went with rapat for conducting investigation on application dated 04.12.2025 by Surjit Singh. former Sarpanch son of Khajan Singh resident of Bhindi Saidan against Lakhwinder Singh son of Kashmir Singh, Surinder Singh son of Kashmir Singh, Bagicha Singh son of Charan Singh, Billa Singh son of Shinda Singh, Gopi Singh son of Baldev Singh resident of Bhindi Saidan, came present at Committee House at Rajasansi. During the investigation, it was found that Surjit Singh etc. and Lakhwinder Singh had altercation while filing papers for Zilla Parishad and Block Samiti elections. During the altercation, both parties got into a fight and abused each other and both parties hit chairs to each other. However, no sharp weapon was used by any party during the altercation. So, offence under



Section 115(2) of the BNS is found to be made out. Whenever the doctor result will be produced by any party then appropriate legal action will be initiated. Regarding which, Station House Officer Police Station is being informed. Rapat is registered for information.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody since 06.12.2025. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further argued that the case in hand is one of version and cross-version. Learned counsel has further submitted that, assuming *arguendo*, the prosecution version is taken to be correct, the petitioner is attributed the role of giving a dattar injury on the foot of the injured. Learned counsel for the petitioner has specifically submitted that the fire shot alleged to have been given to the victim side in the FIR in question has been alleged qua one Satnam Singh alias Satta and not the present petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that the injured stands discharged from the hospital a long time ago. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is a young man aged 20 years with no criminal antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 08.04.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 06.12.2025 wherein after investigation was carried out and challan stands presented on 03.02.2026.



Total 25 prosecution witnesses have been cited but none has been examined till date. It is thus indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. The rival contentions raised by learned counsel give rise to debatable issues which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 08.04.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 3 months and 27 days & is not shown to be involved in any other case.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell-phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of



the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.
(vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

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

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

09.04.2026
jatin

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