



CRM-M-21711 of 2026

-1-

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

239

**CRM-M-21711 of 2026
Date of Decision: 26.05.2026**

Daljeet Singh @ Channi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. B.S. Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Srishti S. Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate
for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.10 dated 15.01.2026 registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 351(2), 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Anandpur Sahib, District Rupnagar.

2. Brief facts as per the prosecution case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused, armed with deadly weapons, attacked and caused serious injuries to the complainant with an intention to kill him. Hence, the present FIR.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the said offence. He further submitted that the alleged occurrence took place on 11.01.2026 but the FIR in question was registered on 15.01.2026 i.e. after an unexplained delay of 04 days, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. He further argued that if the contents of the FIR are taken to be true, even then no specific injury has been attributed to the present petitioner and he is stated to have given rod blow on the leg of the complainant and the said injury is stated to be simple in nature and thus, the same does not attract Section 109 of BNS, which has been added by the prosecution later only to make the offence graver. Further, co-accused Neetan Kumar @ Jagu has already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 30.03.2026. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as he is not involved in any other case and no recovery is to be effected from him. The petitioner is in custody since 18.01.2026. The investigation in this case is complete, challan stands presented but charges are yet to be framed. He submitted that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner and status report in the matter, which are taken on record and while referring to the status report, he has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by



submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is a first time offender as he is not involved in any other case.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant has filed her Memorandum of Appearance, which is taken on record and she, while opposing the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 04 months; he has clean antecedents; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges are yet to be framed; the complicity of the petitioner is a matter of trial and the same will take a long time to conclude. Thus, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

8. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

**CRM-M-21711 of 2026****-4-**

9. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.05.2026*D.Bansal***(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No