

CRM-M-25546-2025(O&M)

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-25546-2025(O&M)
Decided on : 09.02.2026

Pawandeep Singh @ Pamma

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab.

Mr. Jaspreet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the complainant

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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Pawandeep Singh @ Pamma	110	28.12.2024	105, 3(5) of BNS, 2023	Chohla Sahib	Tarn Taran

2. The complainant in this case is Jaspal Singh, who is uncle (chacha) of deceased-Satinderpal Singh, aged 30 years. As per allegations in the FIR, on 27.12.2024, while complainant was standing outside at the gate of his house at about 8.00 p.m., he saw Mandeep Singh @ Kala, calling his nephew, Satinderpal



Singh, outside the house. Later, that evening at around 9.45. p.m., Mandeep Singh came to the house of complainant and stated that Satinderpal Singh is lying in an unconscious condition in the street, claiming someone had left him there. Based on these allegations, a complaint was moved at 1.10 p.m. on the next day i.e. 28.12.2024 and a formal FIR was subsequently registered at 2.40 p.m. During investigation, witness-Daljit Singh was examined, who projected himself as an eye witness.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, while addressing arguments, submits that the said witness-Daljit Singh, who projected himself as an eye witness, is a co-villager and in cross examination he admitted to be a political opponent of the accused party. Counsel raises doubt over the veracity of the deposition made by the said witness, by pointing out that, as per the statement given before the Court, he had witnessed the incident at about 7.30 p.m., while returning from a shop after purchasing medicines. However, as per the deposition, no hue and cry was made by him to attract the attention of anyone, to save the deceased from the clutches of the accused.

4. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions advance on behalf of the petitioner, submits that considering the nature and gravity of the offence alleged against hi, he is not entitled to the concession of regular bail. Accordingly, he prays for dismissal of the present bail petition.

5. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

This Court finds that, even if version of witness were to be accepted, its reliability remains questionable, as until 9.35 p.m. he had neither gone to the house of the complainant to inform about the incident nor did he intervene while



CRM-M-25546-2025(O&M)

3

the injuries were being caused to the deceased by the accused persons.

Furthermore, despite his claim of being an eye witness, the reason why the complaint was given in the post lunch period to the police, would also be a subject matter of consideration. This delay raises the question of whether the version presented is actual or merely concocted, and whether the witness namely, Daljit Singh, is reliable or not. The petitioner is inside jail since 28.12.2024 and out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, only two have been examined till date.

6. 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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

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

8. 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.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 09, 2026

reena

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