



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

CRM-M-25965-2026

Date of decision : 22.05.2026

Jagroop Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. A.S. Nirmaan, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.181 dated 12.06.2023, under Sections 307, 452, 506, 148, 149 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act (Section 201 of IPC and Sections 54 & 59 of Arms Act, added lateron), registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

2. As per the facts of the case, the present FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Jaswinder Kaur. It was alleged that on 12.06.2023 at about 6 P.M., when complainant's husband Harjinder Singh, elder son Daljit Singh and younger daughter-in-law Sarabjit Kaur were sitting in the courtyard, then Rajinder Singh @ Malli, his nephew Jagroop Singh (petitioner herein) along with 04 unknown persons, armed with weapons entered into their house. It was alleged that accused-Jagroop Singh fired a direct gun-shot from his pistol upon the complainant, with intention to kill her, which hit at her right knee. Complainant threw her glass of tea on Rajinder Singh @ Malli which fell upon his face and then while firing shots from his pistol, Jagroop Singh and other accused persons ran away from the spot on their vehicles with their respective

weapons. The complainant raised alarm and she was admitted to the Civil



Hospital Tarn Taran. The motive behind this occurrence was that earlier an altercation took place between Jagroop Singh and younger son of the complainant in which Jagroop Singh received injuries on his arm due to which he kept grudge against her younger son. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprit. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 27.01.2024. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 19.08.2025. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner was arrested on 27.01.2024. He submits that the alleged occurrence has taken place place on 12.06.2023. He submits that the petitioner has been alleged to have fired at the knee of the complainant. To buttress his arguments, he contends that the complainant has been examined before the trial Court as PW-1 and her husband, who was also the eye-witness, has been examined as PW-2 and both these witnesses have not supported the case of the prosecution and have been declared hostile. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 02 years and the material witnesses already stand examined, who have not supported the case of the prosecution. He submits that though the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. He thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.



4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR. He submits that it was the petitioner who fired at the complainant. He submits that even if the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution, there are other evidences produced by the prosecution for proving the complicity of the petitioner. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 20 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined including the complainant/injured. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner in the present case was arrested on 27.01.2024. The injured/complainant has already been examined as PW-1 and she has not supported the case of the prosecution. Even her husband, who was the eye-witness has not supported the case of the prosecution and both were declared hostile. The material witnesses already stand examined. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 02 years, 03 months and 20 days as on 21.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases, however, in 01 case he is on bail. Needless to say that every accused has the fundamental right of speedy trial.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem



695 has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

8. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in ‘**Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024**’, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

9. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, 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. 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

22.05.2026
ps-I

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No