



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

**CRM-M No.21021 of 2026
Date of decision: 24.04.2026**

Dilpreet Singh @ Kaila

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

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

Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 (corresponding to Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.148 dated 07.11.2025, registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 126(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190 of the BNS (corresponding to Sections 307, 323, 341, 506, 148, 149 IPC) and Sections 117(2), 117(4) BNS added later on, at Police Station Chhajali, District Sangrur.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the criminal law was set into motion on the statement of complainant Kamaljit Singh, who alleged that on 05.11.2025, at about 7:30 AM, while he was going on his motorcycle to deliver milk, certain accused persons armed with iron rods and iron pipes intercepted him and wrongfully restrained him. It is alleged that Dilpreet Singh @ Kaila exhorted the co-accused to teach the complainant a lesson



for an earlier dispute, and thereafter inflicted a blow with an iron rod aimed at his head with intention to kill, which landed on his arm when he tried to save himself. The other accused persons also allegedly caused multiple injuries on his legs and body with iron rods and pipes. Upon raising alarm, people gathered at the spot and the accused fled away.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on account of prior enmity and the manner in which multiple persons have been roped in, including those who were subsequently found innocent during investigation, clearly establishes that the present FIR is tainted. He has further argued that although the FIR has been registered under Section 307 IPC, none of the seven injuries has been declared as dangerous to life. The injuries have been declared as grievous with blunt weapon, thereby inviting an offence under Section 325 IPC, which is bailable. The role attributed to the petitioner is that he, with an intention to kill, gave an iron rod blow towards the head of the complainant; however, the same landed on the left arm of the complainant, which he raised to save himself. The remaining injuries are also on non-vital parts of the body. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last five months and five days, charges are yet to be framed, and conclusion of the trial is likely to take time; therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail petition on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner, who along with co-accused formed an unlawful assembly



and caused seven injuries on the person of the complainant. The injuries have been declared grievous in nature with a blunt weapon and, though none of the injuries has been declared dangerous to life, the same were inflicted with an intention to kill. However, it is admitted that the challan in this case has been presented, charges are yet to be framed, and as per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last five months and five days.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court finds that though the offence under Section 307 IPC has been invoked, none of the injuries sustained by the complainant has been declared dangerous to life. All the injuries have been opined to be grievous in nature caused by blunt weapon, thereby *prima-facie* attracting offences under Sections 325/323 IPC, which are bailable. The challan in the present case has already been presented; however, the charges are yet to be framed and the trial is likely to take considerable time. The role attributed to the petitioner is that he gave a blow which landed on the left arm of the complainant, which is a non-vital part of the body, and no injury has been attributed to the petitioner on any vital organ. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last five months and five days and further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, this Court deems it a fit case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the



satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

24.04.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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