



CRM-M-24779-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-24779-2026

Date of Decision: 07.05.2026

Sandeep Singh @ Boxer

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Shivang Berry, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kuljinder Dhindsa, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.189 dated 02.10.2024, under Sections 103(1), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Mandi Gobindgarh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Manjit Singh. It was alleged that he had two children. His elder son Tarandeep Singh @ Nannu (deceased) was of the age of 35 years and was doing scrap work. He had acquaintances with Dheeraj Batta @ Dheer, Prince Bhullar and Titli. All of them used to visit him occasionally. However, later on his son Tarandeep Singh came to know about their character that they were involved in several cases and were also involved in illegal activities. Hence, his son Tarandeep Singh started distancing himself from those persons. On account of this, they nurtured grudge against the son of the complainant. On 02.10.2024, his son left home for village Badeenpur to meet his friend Tinku in his Swift Car bearing registration No.PB-91R-2974. At about, 06:30 p.m., some passerby called the complainant and told that he is speaking from village Badeenpur and his son had been attacked with sharp edged weapon and was lying in injured



CRM-M-24779-2026

-2-

condition. On receiving the information, he reached the village Badeenpur and found his son lying in pool of blood. Son of the complainant told him that Dheeraj Batta, Prince Bhullar, Titli, Gaggi and Sandeep Boxer (the petitioner) all came in a black Scorpio vehicle and they were all armed with sharp edged weapons. His son further told him that they all dragged him out of his car and attacked on his head, arms and legs with the weapons being carried by them and thereafter, fled away from the spot in their vehicle with their respective weapons. After telling this, son of the complainant became unconscious. He was shifted to the IVY Hospital, Khanna for treatment, however, doctors declared him dead. It was alleged that accused Dheeraj Batta, Prince Bhullar, Titli, Gaggi and Sandeep Boxer had killed his son Tarandeep Singh as he objected to their involvement in bad activities. Thus, request was made to take legal action against all the accused. On the basis of the allegations made, the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 04.10.2024. Postmortem of the dead body was conducted and the supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 19.03.2026. Being aggrieved, the petitioner approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the



CRM-M-24779-2026

-3-

grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli, Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh and Dheeraj Batta @ Dheer. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 15.01.2026 passed in **CRM-M-28340-2025** and **CRM-M-65270-2025**, whereby, co-accused Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli, Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh and Dheeraj Batta @ Dheer, have been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who have already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli, Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh and Dheeraj Batta @ Dheer. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in this case on 04.10.2024. Co-accused, namely, Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli, Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh and Dheeraj Batta @ Dheer are on bail and as stated before this Court, case of the petitioner is at par with that of the co-accused. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 06 months & 25 days as on 06.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in eight other cases, out of which in two cases, he has been acquitted, in two cases, he is on bail and in once case he has been discharged.



CRM-M-24779-2026

-4-

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

07.05.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No