



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

218

CRM-M-19766-2026
Date of decision: 20.04.2026

DILPREET SINGH

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Yajur Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.
(*Through Video Conferencing*).

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

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. 270 dated 10.10.2025, registered under Section(s) 126(2), 118(2), 118(1), 115(2), 191(3) and 190 of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar, Rural.

2. The present FIR has been registered on the statement of Gola Singh who alleged that on 08.09.2025, at about 8:15 pm, when he was returning to Village Dinewali on his motorcycle after closing his shop, a person namely Rana Singh alongwith five unknown persons allegedly intercepted the complainant and caused injuries with datar.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been implicated subsequently on a supplementary statement, during the course of investigation. He contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused solely for being cousin of co-accused Rana Singh to whom injury attracting Section 118 (2) of BNS has been attributed. He contends that the injury attributed to the petitioner is of 118(1) of BNS. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 11.02.2026. It is further contended that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner which renders the prosecution allegations baseless. He further contends that the petitioner is a young boy aged 20 years and has no other criminal antecedents and prolonged incarceration is likely to expose him to hardened criminals and thus materially impair future prospectus.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid allegations, however, she contends that the petitioner is alleged to have caused an injury on the forehead near the eye-brow with a datar. It is also not disputed that the said datar has not been recovered at the instance of the petitioner herein. The period of custody, the clean antecedents as well as the age of the petitioner are also not disputed.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the young age of the petitioner, his clean antecedents, the period of custody undergone, the nature of allegations as well as the stage of the proceedings where the investigation is still underway as well as the

offences being triable by the Court of Magistrate, 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.

APRIL 20, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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