



CRM-M-20501-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-20501-2026

Date of Decision: 07.05.2026

Jaspreet Singh @ Jassi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Anant Singh Gill, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.145 dated 18.07.2023, under Section 302, 148, 149, 120-B IPC (Section 34 of IPC deleted lateron), registered at Police Station Sadar Ludhiana.

2. Succinctly, facts of the present case are that the FIR in question was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Jaspreet Singh, who is brother-in-law Baninderdeep Singh (since deceased). It was alleged that his younger sister got married on 25.02.2013 with Baninderdeep Singh. In the year 2017, both had gone to Canada and returned back to India in the month of March. It was alleged that on 18.07.2023 at about 12:15 PM, his sister Sukhbir Kaur informed him telephonically that his brother-in-law had been caused injuries by someone and taken to DMC Hospital for treatment. It was alleged that the complainant alongwith his cousin brother Sukhjot Singh reached the hospital where Bal Singh and Parminder Singh were already there who took his brother- in-law Baninderdeep Singh to Hospital in an injured condition. However, the doctor declared him dead. After inquiry, Bal Singh told the complainant that he and Baninderdeep Singh were riding on their motorcycle bearing No.PB-10-GA-2735 and were going



CRM-M-20501-2026

-2-

from his Farm House to his home in Lalto Kalan. When they reached T-Point Chakar Colony, two motorbikers came from behind and hit Baninderdeep Singh on the backside of his neck with an iron dattar. Baninderdeep Singh fell down and was hit by sharp edged weapon by four people on his neck and other body parts while he was lying down. Hence, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. The FIR was registered. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the complicity of present petitioner was surfaced on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant. Petitioner was arrested on 26.07.2023. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined to him vide order dated 04.04.2026. Hence, being aggrieved, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition for grant of concession of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Jugraj Singh @ Jagraj Singh, Suhail Ali and Varinder Singh @ Vicky. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 20.03.2026 passed in **CRM-M-229-2025** and other connected cases, whereby, co-accused Jugraj Singh @ Jagraj Singh, Suhail Ali and Varinder Singh @ Vicky, have been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who have already been granted bail.



CRM-M-20501-2026

-3-

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Jugraj Singh @ Jagraj Singh, Suhail Ali and Varinder Singh @ Vicky. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in this case on 26.07.2023. Co-accused, namely, Jugraj Singh @ Jagraj Singh, Suhail Ali and Varinder Singh @ Vicky are on bail and as stated before this Court, case of the petitioner is at par with that of the co-accused. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 09 months & 10 days as on 06.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case, however, he has been arrested in the same on the production warrants.

6. Speedy trial is the right of every accused. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695 has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra,



Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

10. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

07.05.2026
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No