

2026.PHHC:079908



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

244

CRM M-27046-2026

Date of Decision: 18.05.2026

Harwinder Singh @ Honey

...Petitioner (s)

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Sanpreet Singh Kalra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jasinder Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, with a prayer to grant him regular bail in case FIR No.149 dated 23.09.2025 under Sections 109, 304(1), 118(1), 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS 2023 (earlier Sections 307, 379, 324, 506 and 34 I.P.C) registered at Police Station Doraha, District Ludhiana (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the prosecution case, on 19.09.2025, the petitioner, along with other co-accused, came to the shop of the complainant on a motorcycle and, after threatening him, they had snatched a sum of Rs.5,000/- from him. Further, it was alleged that Pritpal Singh had hit the complainant with a wrench and the petitioner and Gobind had also beaten him up. However, the only role ascribed to the petitioner is that he, along with Gobind, had

caused injuries with fists and punches only. In the present case, the petitioner was arrested on 23.09.2025 and is in custody since then. Moreover, the *challan* has been presented against him on 10.02.2026 and charge was framed on 23.02.2026. Still further, by referring to the compromise deed dated 02.02.2026 (Annexure P-3), learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have entered into a compromise and the complainant did not want to pursue the matter any further. Thus, the petitioner deserves to be granted the concession of bail by this Court.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case, admittedly, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about seven months and the parties have entered into a compromise with each other. Moreover, since the petitioner and complainant have settled all their disputes, this Court is inclined to take a lenient view of the matter.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

18.05.2026
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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