



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

107+212

CRM-20334-2026 in/and
CRM-M-19892-2026
Date of decision: 19.05.2026

SUKHWINDER SINGH ALIAS KIRLUPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Gopal Singh Nahel, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-20334-2026

Application is allowed as prayed for and Annexures P-5 to P-8
are taken on record.

CRM-M-19892-2026

1. The instant **first petition** has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 154 dated 19.09.2024, registered under Section(s) 110, 115(2), 324(4), 324(5) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 127(1), 191(3), 190, 110, 127(1) were deleted and Section 103, 126(2), 238 of BNS, 2023 added

later on) at Police Station Sadar Dhuri, District Sangrur.

2. Perusal of file reveals that this case was registered on the statement of complainant Satgur Singh alleging that on 18.09.2024, he accompanied Jaspreet Singh and Harbans Singh Sarpanch of village Kakarwal, to install a new motor. As they were returning on motorcycle bearing No.PB-13AM-4326 driven by Jaspreet Singh (on which he was the pillion rider) near bus stop of village at about 09:00 pm, where the street light was on, his co-villagers Gurpreet Singh, Monu Singh, Goldy (each of them armed with Axe) and Sukhwinder Singh alias Kirlu (armed with iron rod) accompanied by 2-3 unknown persons were standing there and they waylaid them. Gurpreet Singh raised a Lalkara and gave Axe blow towards him, but the blow landed on the forehead of Jaspreet Singh from the blunt side. Monu Singh again gave Axe blow towards his head, but he sat down and blow landed on the left ear of Jaspreet Singh. Goldy gave Axe blow towards Jaspreet Singh, which landed on the left side of his neck. Sukhwinder Singh gave blow of iron rod on the stomach of Jaspreet Singh, who then fell down. The unknown persons also started damaging the motorcycle and tried to chase him, but he fled. A vehicle was arranged and Jaspreet Singh was taken to Civil Hospital, Dhuri, from where he was referred to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala and then P.G.I. Chandigarh, where he passed away on 03.10.2024. Motive of the occurrence was that Jaspreet Singh had got case registered against said persons who were pressurising him to withdraw the same.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the case, injured-complainant Satgur Singh was accompanying the deceased Jaspreet Singh on a motorcycle before being allegedly followed

and intercepted by co-accused Gurpreet Singh, accompanied by the petitioner as well as the other co-accused. It is submitted that co-accused Gurpreet Singh, Monu Singh and Balwinder Singh @ Goldy were allegedly armed with gandasi while the petitioner is alleged to have been armed with an iron rod. It is submitted that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner. He further contends that the petitioner has clean antecedents and even the complainant eye-witness namely Satgur Singh and Karamjit Kaur (widow of deceased Jaspreet Singh) have not supported the case of the prosecution qua the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 23.09.2024 and only 05 witnesses have been examined so far. It is contended that the petitioner has clean antecedents and there is no likelihood of the petitioner absconding or fleeing from the process of law.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the above said facts at this stage, however, he contends that the petitioner along with co-accused caused injuries to deceased Jaspreet Singh. Co-accused Gurpreet Singh had raised a lalkara on account of old enmity, which led to the attack.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the present case and taking into consideration that there are arguable issues with respect to the role and participation of the petitioner in the alleged commission of crime, coupled with his clean antecedents, the period of custody, the stage of the trial as well as absence of any recovery and material prosecution witnesses

not supporting the case of the prosecution, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MAY 19, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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