



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

230

CRM-M-24050-2026
Decided on : 05.05.2026

Dilsher Singh @ Shamsher Singh @ Shera . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sohrab Dhanda, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant 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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Dilsher Singh @ Shamsher Singh @ Shera	21	30.03.2021	S. 436, 427, 506, 34 of IPC [corresponding S. 326(g), 324, 351, 3(5) of BNS, 2023]	Jhander, Police District Amritsar Rural	Amritsar

2. The case was registered on the statement of Harjit Kaur wife of Tarsem Singh that she is working in a factory Meera Kot, Amritsar. She is having three children. Elder one is daughter namely Manpreet Kaur and sons namely Lovepreet Singh and Gurpreet Singh. About 15/20 days ago, her son Lovepreet Singh performed love marriage with Komaljit Kaur daughter of Joginder Singh. The parents of Komaljit Kaur used to threaten them. On



12.03.2021, she and her son Gurpreet Singh came to the house and saw that Shamsher Singh, brother of Komaljit Kaur and Anmol Singh ransacking the articles of house and they set two rooms of the house on fire. With great difficulty, they doused the fire.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the alleged occurrence had taken place on 12.03.2021, whereas the FIR came to be registered after a delay of about 18 days, i.e. on 30.03.2021.

It is further submitted that considering the nature of allegations, petitioner as well as his co-accused Anmol Singh @ Dilawar Singh @ Mol, were initially granted concession of regular bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, vide order dated 15.07.2021.

However, on account of his absence from the Court proceedings on 06.02.2023, bail granted to the petitioner was cancelled and proclamation proceedings were initiated against him vide order dated 04.11.2025. Thereafter, petitioner was arrested on 27.11.2025 and since then, he is inside the jail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that after his re-arrest, petitioner is inside jail for more than a period of about 05 months and, therefore, in the given facts and circumstances, he deserves concession of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 04.05.2026, 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.



6. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that keeping in view the conduct and antecedents of the petitioner, particularly the fact that he remained absent from the trial proceedings for a considerable period, he does not deserve concession of regular bail.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the relevant material available on record with their able assistance.

8. It is an admitted position that petitioner remained absent from the trial proceedings for a considerable period and was subsequently declared proclaimed offender. However, it is also a matter of record that after his re-arrest on 27.11.2025, petitioner has remained inside the jail for a period of more than 05 months.

Though, conduct of the petitioner in remaining absent from the Court proceedings cannot be appreciated, yet continued incarceration of the petitioner for an indefinite period would not serve any useful purpose, particularly when his presence during trial can be secured by imposing appropriate conditions.

Accordingly, without commenting upon the merits of the case, and keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances, this Court deems it appropriate to grant concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

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

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any



threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 05, 2026
J.Ram

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