



CRM-M-19272-2025
1
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

134
CRM-M-19272-2025(O&M)
Decided on :24.03.2026
Dilpreet Singh @ Deepa @ Jaspreet Singh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab and another . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Rajdeep Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ishaan Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.138 dated 31.12.2024, under Sections 110, 126(2), 115(2), 351(3), 3(5) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Cheema, District Sangrur.
2. At the very outset, Mr. P.S. Sekhon, learned Senior Advocate submits that, in the FIR, the petitioner's name was mentioned as Jaspreet Singh, and subsequently, in the statement recorded under Section 161 CrPC of the complainant, it was clarified that the petitioner is also known by the name Dilpreet Singh @ Deepa. The said fact is not disputed by learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the complainant. Therefore, the present order shall be read qua Dilpreet Singh @ Deepa @ Jaspreet Singh.

**CRM-M-19272-2025****2**

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has filed amended memo of parties in Court today. Same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book.

3. Incident in the present case took place on 29.12.2024 and was reported at the instance of complainant-Gurmail Singh, who is the father of injured-Iqbal Singh. After completion of the ceremonies of Akhand Path, which commenced on 27.12.2024, wooden logs brought by the villagers were lying outside the house of Mithu Singh and were being transported to Village Haltiwale Dera by Iqbal Singh.

At about 2:15 p.m., when the complainant was standing near the wooden logs, accused-Dilpreet Singh @ Deepa@ Jaspreet Singh and Harman Singh also arrived to lift the logs. However, same was objected to by the complainant's son, Iqbal Singh. On account of this objection and due to an exchange of heated words at the spot, petitioner-Dilpreet Singh @ Deepa@ Jaspreet Singh, allegedly struck Iqbal Singh on his head with a wooden object.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that certain admitted facts of the case are that both accused, Dilpreet Singh @ Deepa @ Jaspreet Singh and Harman Singh, had reached the spot unarmed, and the incident occurred suddenly on account of the objection raised by Iqbal Singh regarding the lifting of wooden logs lying in front of the house of Mithu Singh.

Incident took place during the daytime on 29.12.2024. After being hospitalized, injured-Iqbal Singh was discharged on 01.01.2025.

Presently, as informed by learned counsel for the complainant, a Medical

**CRM-M-19272-2025****3**

Board of PGIMER has been constituted to provide a fresh opinion regarding the nature of the injuries.

Learned Senior Counsel also submits that petitioner is aged about 24 years and is in custody for the last one year and twenty days. The statement of injured-Iqbal Singh, has already been recorded, therefore, counsel prays for grant of bail.

5. Learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the petitioner is actively involved in the commission of the offence as alleged in the FIR. It is further submitted that petitioner is in custody since 03.03.2025, and the period of custody, though substantial, cannot be viewed in isolation in light of the seriousness of the allegations and the nature of injuries suffered by the victim. It is contended that a Medical Board opinion from PGIMER is still awaited regarding the nature of injuries, and trial is at a crucial stage. Therefore, at this stage, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book along with the documents appended thereto.

7. In the backdrop of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court does not find any substantial reason to continue petitioner's detention in custody any further, particularly for the reason that out of the total list of 20 prosecution witnesses, a majority of them are yet to be examined by the prosecution. Trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude, and therefore, this Court is of the



CRM-M-19272-2025

4

considered view that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further custody.

Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

24.03.2026

Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*