



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CRM-M-20842-2026
Date of decision: 23.04.2026

BHINDER SINGH @ BHINDERPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

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

Present: - Mr. Sukhcharan S. Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant 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, under Section(s) 110, 115(2), 324(4), 324(5), 127(1), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Section 103, 126(2), 238 of BNS added later on and Sections 110 and 127(1) of the BNS deleted vide DDR No. 33 dated 03.10.2024); registered at Police Station Sadar Dhuri, District Sangrur.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present FIR has been registered on the complaint of Satgur Singh to the effect that he alongwith Jaspreet Singh had gone to install a new water motor for Harbans Singh (Sarpanch of village Kakkarwal). After finishing the work, they were returning to their village on motorcycle when they were stopped by the accused namely Gurpreet Singh son of Poppy who was

holding a gandasa, Monu Singh son of Satnam Singh also holding a gandasa, Goldy son of Bhola Singh armed with Gandasa and Sukhwinder Singh @ Kirlu son of Makhan Singh carrying an iron rod alongwith 2-3 other unidentified persons. They gave injuries on the head of Jaspreet Singh which eventually resulted into death of Jaspreet Singh.

3. He contends that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 02.12.2024, however, as a matter of fact, the petitioner was already in custody in another case bearing FIR No. 74 dated 05.08.2024, in which he had been arrested on 18.09.2024. It is contended that as per the FIR, the present incident took place at around 9:00 P.M. at which time the petitioner was already in custody in the aforesaid FIR No. 74 dated 05.08.2024, registered under Sections 109, 118(1), 115, 191(3) and 351 of the BNS (Section 117(2) BNS had added later on) at Police Station Longowal, District Sangrur, Punjab. He contends that subsequent to the withdrawal of the earlier petition for bail, there has been material change in as much as Satgur Singh i.e. the sole eye-witness of the incident has deposed before the Court wherein he has not supported the case of the prosecution and has specifically deposed that the petitioner was not the person who was present at the time of giving beatings to him and deceased Jaspreet Singh on 18.09.2024. He contends that there has been no recovery at the instance of the petitioner and except for the statement of the complainant, there was no other evidence to link the petitioner with the commission of the offence.

4. It has further argued that the other similarly placed co-accused have been granted concession of regular bail by this Court.

5. Learned State Counsel is not in a position to dispute that the eye-witness Satgur Singh had not supported the case of the prosecution and

has not identified the petitioner to be the one who was present at the place of occurrence. It is further not disputed that the petitioner is in custody since 02.12.2024 and has already undergone an actual custody of more than 01 year and 04 months.

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

7. Without commenting on the merits of the present case and taking into consideration that there would be arguable issue with respect to involvement of the petitioner in the commission of the crime, absence of recovery from him, the eye-witness not supporting the case of the prosecution and also the stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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 23, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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