



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
106
CRM-M-23383-2025
Decided on : 06.03.2026
ARJAN SINGH ALIAS MANNU ALIAS MIKA
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rajiv Kumar Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The **instant 2nd petition** has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Arjan Singh alias Mannu alias Mika, aged about 23 years	255	10.11.2021	302, 323, 148, 149 of IPC	Kamboj	Amritsar

2. On the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that first bail petition, i.e., CRM-M-18418-2024, filed by the petitioner, was disposed of as withdrawn, vide order dated 02.07.2024 (Annexure P-5).



It is further submitted that petitioner is in judicial custody for a period of more than 04 years and 03 months. He is not involved in any other criminal case, and trial is not proceeding at the required pace. In these circumstances, petitioner has filed present second petition seeking the concession of regular bail.

3. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by concocting a false version against him.

4. It is further argued that similarly situated co-accused, namely Sukhbaj Singh alias Baaj, who, as per allegations in the FIR, had given a *kirch* blow below the nipple on the left side of the chest of the deceased-Sukhdev Singh (who is the brother of the complainant- Amarjit Singh alias Amba), has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 05.09.2023 passed in CRM-M-42870-2023 (Annexure P-3).

It is contended that similar allegations have been attributed to the present petitioner-Arjan Singh alias Mannu alias Mika, wherein it is alleged that he gave a *kirch* blow to Sukhdev Singh (since deceased), hitting above the nipple on the left side of the chest. The third accused-Baldev Singh, who was also allegedly armed with a *kirch* and is stated to have inflicted blows on the left side of the stomach of the deceased-Sukhdev Singh, was, however, declared innocent during the course of investigation.

5. Referring to the order dated 05.09.2023 passed in CRM-M-42870-2023 in the case of co-accused Sukhbaj Singh alias Baaj, learned



counsel for the petitioner submits that when the complainant appeared in the witness box, he categorically deposed that Sukhbaj Singh alias Baaj was not the person who had caused injuries to the deceased. Thus, it is submitted that there is a material improvement in the version of the prosecution, particularly in the statement of the star witness Amarjit Singh alias Amba.

It is, therefore, argued that it would be a moot question for determination before the trial Court at the time of final adjudication as to who actually caused the *kirch* injury to the deceased, whether the already bailed-out accused Sukhbaj Singh alias Baaj or the present petitioner-Arjan Singh alias Mannu alias Mika.

6. Above all, learned counsel submits that petitioner cannot be detained in custody for an indefinite period, as he has already undergone incarceration for about 04 years and 03 months.

It is further submitted that out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, only 06 witnesses have been examined so far. Consequently, conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner incarcerated any further, and petitioner deserves to be granted the concession of regular bail in the present case.

7. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 05.03.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.



As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 04 years 03 months and 18 days period inside jail and there is no other case registered against him.

8. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it.

9. Admittedly, as per the status of trial, material witness, namely Amarjit Singh alias Amba (complainant), has already been examined, and therefore, there appears to be no likelihood of the petitioner influencing the said witness in the event of his release on bail. Moreover, petitioner has already remained in custody for a period of approximately four years and four months, and has, thus, not seen the light of day outside the jail during this period.

As far as progress of the trial is concerned, 10 more prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Considering the fact that the trial is not proceeding at the desired pace, this Court is of the view that personal liberty of the petitioner should not be curtailed any further, by keeping him incarcerated for an indefinite period.

10. In view of the totality of the circumstances, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief



CRM-M-23383-2025

5

Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, 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.

13. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

06.03.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO