



CRM-M-23467-2025 and
CRM-M-56220-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

111

CRM-M-23467-2025

Karanvir Singh @ Chhabra

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

111-2

CRM-M-56220-2025

Varun Kumar

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

Decided on :05.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-23467-2025).

Mr. Sunny K. Singla, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-56220-2025).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Both the aforementioned petitions are being disposed of as they arise out of one common FIR.

2. CRM-M-23467-2025 has been filed by petitioner-Karanvir Singh @ Chhabra, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.76 dated 17.04.2024, under Sections 307, 341, 323, 506, 148, 149 IPC, (Sections 324, 325, 34 IPC were added later on and Sections 148/149 IPC deleted later on), registered at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

CRM-M-56220-2025 has been filed by petitioner-Varun Kumar, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 76 dated 17.04.2024, under Sections 307, 341, 323, 324, 325, 148, 149, 201 IPC, registered at Police Station Sangrur, District Sangrur.



CRM-M-23467-2025 and
CRM-M-56220-2025

2

3. As per the case of the prosecution, the FIR was got registered by the injured/complainant Harsh Bagri to the effect that, apart from him, Kartik was also caused injuries by the accused persons, namely i)Varun, ii)Lucky @ Dela, iii) Karanvir Singh @ Chhabbra (petitioner in CRM-M-23467-2025), iv) Sachin and 5–6 other unknown persons.

4. Vide order dated 12.01.2026, following was recorded:

“1. During the course of short hearing, the following facts were noticed:-

(i) There are a total of four accused, namely, (a) Karanvir Singh @ Chhabbra, (b) Nigam @ Lucky, (c) Varun Kumar, and (d) Sachin Kumar @ Chawla;

(ii) There are two injured persons, namely Kartik and Harsh Bagri;

(iii) Injured Harsh Bagri suffered two injuries, whereas injured Kartik suffered seven/eight injuries;

(iv) Petitioner Karanvir Singh @ Chhabbra has been attributed an injury on the right side of the head of injured Kartik, behind the ear, with an iron rod, which is reflected as injury No.1 in the Medico-Legal Report. As per the MLR of injured Kartik, injuries No. 1, 2, 3 and 5 have been declared grievous in nature;

(v) Out of a total of 21 prosecution witnesses, only two formal witnesses have been examined so far, and six witnesses have been given up;

(vi) It is not clear from the record whether the statements of both the injured witnesses have been examined or not.

2. Proceedings before the trial Court are stated to be fixed for 20.01.2026.

*3. List again on 05.03.2026 05.03.2026
05.03.2026.*



**CRM-M-23467-2025 and
CRM-M-56220-2025**

3

Meanwhile, it is expected that the statements of both the injured witnesses shall be recorded at the first instance, without any unnecessary delay, before the next date fixed before this Court.

A copy of this order be forwarded to the concerned trial Court for information and necessary compliance.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.”

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) argue that both the injured witnesses have already been examined and, although they have supported the version of the prosecution, there is nothing on record to prima facie indicate that any injury was caused constituting an offence punishable under Section 109 of the BNS.

Learned counsel further submits that petitioner-**Karanvir Singh @ Chhabbra** and petitioner-**Varun Kumar** are in custody since 14.06.2024 and 03.08.2024, respectively. Counsel further submit that there are a total of 21 prosecution witnesses, of whom only 06 have been examined till date; therefore, trial is likely to take considerable time. In these circumstances, learned counsel pray for the grant of regular bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed a comprehensive status report by way of affidavit of Sukhdev Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Sangrur, in Court today. Same is taken on record and Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper-book.



**CRM-M-23467-2025 and
CRM-M-56220-2025**

4

As per the status report, petitioner **Karanvir Singh @ Chhabbra** (CRM-M-23467-2025), in connivance with the other accused and with common intention, inflicted eight injuries on **Kartik** and two injuries on **Harsh Bagri**, of which injury Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5 were grievous. Petitioner-Karanvir Singh inflicted injury No. 1 on Kartik's head with an iron rod, with the intention to kill him.

Petitioner **Varun Kumar** (CRM-M-56220-2025) is stated to have caused injury No. 3 on the back of Kartik's head with an iron rod and injury No. 1, sharp in nature, on the back of Harsh Bagri's head on the right side.

Learned State counsel submits that the petitioners are also involved in other criminal cases and, therefore, prays for dismissal of the present petitions.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book as well as the documents appended thereto.

8. Despite being queried by the Court, learned State counsel could not point out, if there is any specific injury or even the injuries collectively is opined by the doctor to be dangerous to life. In the absence of such evidence; petitioners are in custody since 14.06.2024 and 03.08.2024 respectively, evidence of the material injured witness(s) already stands recorded; out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, only 06 have been examined till date, and culmination of the trial is likely to take



**CRM-M-23467-2025 and
CRM-M-56220-2025**

5

a long time; this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail of the petitioners.

Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqā Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

10. Petitions stand disposed of.

11. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

05.03.2026

Rashmi

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