



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

225

CRM-M-25722-2025
Decided on : 18.02.2026

Nirmal Singh @ Nimma

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Baljeet Nain, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner – Nirmal Singh @ Nimma, has filed the instant petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.), seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 22 dated 29.01.2020, registered under Sections 302, 323, 341, 506, 427, 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Sadar Patiala, District Patiala, Punjab.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, accused Mahavir was driving the vehicle, accompanied by co-accused, namely, Sukhchain Singh @ Sukhi Bhalwan, Jagdeep Singh @ Kala and Nirmal Singh @ Nimma (petitioner herein). All of them were armed with pistols and allegedly fired shots upon Deepak (son of the complainant). Other co-accused, who were travelling in an Innova vehicle and were armed with rods and kirpans, inflicted injuries upon Sukhmanjeet and Rinku Ram, who were lying on the road.



The complainant, Gian Singh, has already been examined and has supported the case of the prosecution, whereas the eye-witnesses, namely, Sukhmanjeet and Rinku Ram, are yet to be examined.

3. On being asked by the Court, learned State counsel submits that, as per the allegations, petitioner – Nirmal Singh @ Nimma, was armed with a pistol and had fired shots upon the deceased Deepak. He further submits that the bullet recovered from the body of the deceased has matched with the pistol recovered from the possession of the petitioner. The other injured/eye-witnesses are yet to be examined.

4. Zimni orders produced in Court by learned counsel for the petitioner indicate that, for a considerable period, the accused have been seeking exemption from personal appearance and the witnesses have also not been appearing despite issuance of bailable warrants. Since two of the eye-witnesses, namely, Sukhmanjeet and Rinku Ram, are yet to be examined, it is directed that their examination be ensured at the earliest. If required, their presence be secured by issuance of bailable/non-bailable warrants, as deemed appropriate by the prosecution.

5. It is also clarified that since the petitioner has remained in custody for more than five years, trial shall not be adjourned unnecessarily and no unwarranted adjournment shall be granted. In case the trial is delayed on account of non-appearance of official witnesses, the concerned Senior Superintendent of Police shall ensure that the position is clarified before the learned trial Court.

6. In view of the above, **the present petition stands dismissed at this stage.**



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

Let a copy of this order be forwarded to the learned trial Court as well as handed over to learned State counsel for its onward transmission to the office of the concerned Senior Superintendent of Police for compliance.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 18, 2026
J.Ram

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