

2026:PHHC:089790



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

289 CRM-M No.31553 of 2026
Date of decision: 03.07.2026

Sukhwant Singh @ Sukha ... Petitioner
Vs.
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate,
Ms. Sapna Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Souravdeep Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate,
with Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under
Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short
'BNSS') seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
73	12.04.2025	Sadar Faridkot, District Faridkot	109 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNS") and 27 of Arms Act, 1959

2. As per the allegations, on 12.04.2025, the complainant Gurjit

2026:PHHC:089790



Singh along with his cousin Jaswant Singh was present in the Gurudwara of their village and they were cleaning the same when the petitioner along with his son Gurbans Singh reached there on an Aactiva vehicle. Accused Gurbans Singh made an exhortation and thereafter the petitioner fired 4-5 shots with his licenced revolver thereby injuring Jaswant Singh, cousin brother of the complainant in his abdomen. On clamour being raised, some other persons reached at the spot and then the assailants fled away. While alleging that the petitioner and co-accused had committed the occurrence due to political rivalry, the complainant prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 13.04.2025. The co-accused was subsequently arrested. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. Infact, the injured Jaswant Singh had pointed a pistol towards him while he was working in the Gurudwara and was about to fire a shot at him and it was only in exercise of his right of private defence that he had fired shot upon the injured to scare him. The shot had accidentally hit his abdomen. He is in custody since long. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. His antecedents are clean. There are no chances of his absconding. He has a permanent abode. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

2026:PHHC:089790



5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel and learned Senior counsel for the complainant has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He had fired several shots upon the victim with clear intent to kill him. The victim sustained a traumatic intestinal rupture due to gun shot injury. He has undergone three exploratory laparotomy surgeries and still suffers from chronic postoperative abdominal pain, abdominal wall tightness and a postoperative ventral hernia. More so, the retained bullet fragment still remains in his body for which he may require further surgical intervention for removal. He has been currently ongoing treatment in Canada for the persistent long term complications. He is yet to be examined. There are chances of petitioner's intimidating him and other material witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. It is, thus, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have opened fire with a firearm upon the victim as on 12.04.2025. The firearm so used by him had hit the victim Jaswant Singh, thereby causing injury on the right side of his abdomen which was obviously dangerous to life. The complainant has placed on record a certificate issued by his treating doctor at Canada showing the factum of his having undergone as many as three surgeries and about other long term complications arising from the gun shot injury sustained in the incident. The allegations against the petitioner are serious

2026:PHHC:089790



in nature and make out a prima facie case for commission of subject offences. The material witnesses including the complainant are yet to be examined. The apprehension that the petitioner may intimidate them cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. Taking in view of the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail at this stage. Therefore, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

03.07.2026
Parveen Sharma

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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