



223

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

**CRM-M No.29522 of 2026
Date of Decision: 27.05.2026**

Dev Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Jitender Singh Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0145, dated 18.07.2023, under Sections 302 & 34 IPC (Section 34 of IPC deleted lateron and Sections 148, 149, 120-B of IPC added later on)), registered at Police Station Sadar Ludhiana, District Ludhiana.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Jaspreet Singh, who is brother-in-law of Baninderdeep Singh (since deceased). It was alleged that his younger sister got married on 25.02.2013 with Baninderdeep Singh. In the year 2017, both had gone to Canada and returned back to India in the month of March. It was alleged that on 18.07.2023 at about 12:15 PM, his sister Sukhbir Kaur informed the complainant telephonically that his brother-in-law was caused



injuries by someone and taken to DMC Hospital for treatment. It was alleged that the complainant alongwith his cousin brother, namely, Sukhjit Singh reached the hospital where Bal Singh and Parminder Singh were already there, who took his brother- in-law, namely, Baninderdeep Singh to Hospital in an injured condition. However, the doctor declared him dead. After inquiry, Bal Singh told the complainant that he and Baninderdeep Singh were riding on their motorcycle bearing No.PB-10-GA-2735 and were going from his Farm House to his home in Lalto Kalan. When they reached T-Point Chakar Colony, two motor bikers came from behind and hit Baninderdeep Singh on the backside of his neck with an *iron datar*. Baninderdeep Singh fell down and he was hit by sharp edged weapons by four people on his neck and other body parts while he was lying down. Hence, the request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 08.09.2023. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 12.05.2026. Hence, being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition



praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He, at the outset, prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Jugraj Singh @ Jagraj Singh, Suhail Ali, Varinder Singh @ Vicky and Jaspreet Singh @ Jassi. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders dated 20.03.2026 and 07.05.2026 passed in **CRM-M-229-2025; CRM-M-3513-2026; CRM-M-4778-2026 and CRM-M-20501-2026**, whereby, co-accused, namely, Jugraj Singh @ Jagraj Singh, Suhail Ali, Varinder Singh @ Vicky and Jaspreet Singh @ Jassi, have been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who have already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Jugraj Singh @ Jagraj Singh, Suhail Ali, Varinder Singh @ Vicky and Jaspreet Singh @ Jassi. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in this case on 08.09.2023. Co-accused, namely, Jugraj Singh @ Jagraj Singh, Suhail Ali, Varinder Singh @ Vicky and Jaspreet Singh @ Jassi are on bail and as stated before this Court, case of the petitioner is at par with that of the



co-accused. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 10 months & 04 days as on 27.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

7. Needless to say that every accused has the fundamental right of speedy trial. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 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 veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, 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 on the basis of parity.

10. 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.

11. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

27.05.2026
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No