



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

Sr. No.294

CRM-M-27689-2026
Date of Decision: 26.05.2026

SWARAN SINGH @ SARWAN SINGH**...Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present:- Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ritu Raj Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Dhanpat Rai Singla, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 0093 dated 10.10.2025, registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 351(3), 61(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 (earlier Sections 307, 323, 506, 120-B, 148, 149 of IPC) and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act (with Sections 118(1) and 118(2) of BNS, 2023 added later on), at Police Station Nandgarh, District Bathinda.

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Harjinder Singh @ Jind, alleging that a dispute existed regarding approximately 21 acres of land belonging to the Dera of Baba Gareeb Dass, which was being managed under the directions of Baba Manpreet Dass. It is alleged that on 09.10.2025, while the complainant was



proceeding towards the fields, he noticed several persons arriving in vehicles, some of whom were armed with weapons. The present petitioner was allegedly driving one of the vehicles. Co-accused Harcharan Singh allegedly brandished a pistol, raised a lalkara, and instigated the others to teach the complainant party a lesson. Thereafter, co-accused Love Preet Singh @ Labbi allegedly inflicted a kirpan blow on the complainant's head and, when the complainant attempted to save himself, another blow struck his arm. It is further alleged that while the complainant was lying injured, co-accused Gurvinder Singh gave a stick blow on the right side of his head, whereas the present petitioner allegedly brandished a pistol and extended threats to use the same. Thereafter, all the accused fled from the spot.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and is in custody since 20.01.2026. No injury has been attributed to him. The sole injured, Harjinder Singh, sustained two injuries, which have been attributed to co-accused Lovepreet Singh and Gurwinder Singh respectively. The initial allegation of amputation is not supported by medical evidence, which instead opines a grievous injury attracting Section 326 IPC, primarily attributed to Lovepreet Singh. Further, co-accused Gurwinder Singh, attributed Injury No. 2, has already been granted regular bail by this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 01.04.2026 in CRM-M No. 7764 of 2026.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application and submitted that serious allegations have been levelled in the present case. It is contended that he allegedly brandished a pistol and threatened the complainant and his father. A .32 bore pistol is stated to have



been supplied by co-accused Lovepreet Singh @ Labhi and was recovered from the petitioner in FIR No. 125/2025 under the Arms Act. The petitioner is a habitual offender, and the offence is serious in nature involving grievous injuries. There is a strong apprehension that if released on bail, he may threaten witnesses or repeat similar offences. Hence, the petition deserves dismissal.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

6. In the present case, it is not disputed that the petitioner took out his pistol and threatened to use it, it is not the case of the prosecution that any injury was caused by him. The petitioner has been in custody for the last 03 months and 27 days, and no prosecution witness has been examined so far. The trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude. This Court also cannot lose sight of the fact that co-accused Gurwinder Singh has already been granted bail by this Court to whom simple injury has been attributed. Therefore, the case of the present petitioner stands on a better footing, as no injury has been attributed to him. Accordingly, the present petitioner also deserves consideration for the grant of bail on the ground of parity.

7. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, considering the nature of allegations, the role attributed to the petitioner, the period of custody and the stage of trial, this Court is of the view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail

and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

			(MANDEEP PANNU)
			JUDGE
26.05.2026			
Anu	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No