



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

230

CRM-M-25815-2026
Date of decision: 12.05.2026

JARNAIL SINGHPetitioner
VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Nitin Narula, Advocate (Through Video Conferencing) and
Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

***** S

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 0063 dated 14.03.2026, registered under Section(s) 109, 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. As per prosecution story, complainant Harjit Singh alongwith his elder brother Baljit Singh was running a wedding venue namely “Sangum Marriage Palace” in front of Bhatha Hari Singh on the road leading from Ajnala to Amritsar. On 14.03.2026, their wedding venue was booked by Tarlok Singh son of Shingara Singh. After completion of the Marriage/Shagun ceremony, some of the guests were preparing to leave and some had already left. The complainant submitted that around 20/25 boys alongwith other persons were present at the venue and at about 05:30 PM,

the aforesaid boys started indulging in verbal altercation with the waiters and also abused them. The complainant alongwith his brother tried to pacify the situation upon which, **Jarnail Singh (i.e.applicant/accused), Dilbagh Singh, Nirmal Singh and Kashmir Singh alias Sona Singh** alongwith **03 unknown persons** started abusing the complainant and his brother as well and gave beatings to them. In the meanwhile, **Kashmir Singh alias Sona Singh** took out 'khanjar (kirch)' out of his dub and **Nirmal Singh alias Gaivy** took the said 'khanjar (kirch)' from him and attacked the complainant's brother Baljit Singh with the intention to kill him which such blow landed on the right side of his abdomen. It is submitted that upon raising hue and cries all the abovesaid persons fled away from the spot alongwith their weapon.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that as per the case of the prosecution, there is no specific injury has been attributed to the petitioner and the allegation against him is that he was accompanying the other co-accused at the spot of the incident. He further contends that there are total four persons who have been nominated as an accused i.e. Jarnail Singh (Petitioner herein), Dilbagh Singh, Nirmal Singh and Kashmir Singh @ Sona Singh and as per the allegations set out in the FIR, Co-accused Kashmir Singh @ Sona Singh was carrying the Kirch which he handed over to Nirmal Singh @ Gaivy who then attacked on the brother of the complainant Baljit Singh. It is submitted that the petitioner has clean antecedents and he is in custody since 14.03.2026. No recovery has been effected from him and his further custodial incarceration is not likely to advance any interest of justice.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the period of custody

and the fact that the injury is attributed to the co-accused.

5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the present case and taking into consideration that the allegation against the petitioner is solely of accompanying the other accused and that the injuries in question has attributable to Nirmal Singh @ Gaivy and bearing in mind the clean antecedents of the petitioner, the period of custody as well as absence of recovery, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MAY 12, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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