



117 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34501-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 11.03.2026

Paramdeep Singh

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. G.P.S. Ghuman, Advocate and
Mr. P.S. Mann, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.126 dated 16.11.2024, under Sections 109, 118(1), 126(2), 351(3) of BNS, registered at Police Station Badali Aala Singh, District Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the present case are that the FIR in question was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Gurfateh Singh. It was alleged that on 14.11.2024 at about 4:30 pm, when the complainant was returning back from Gurudwara Sahib then Paramdeep Singh (present petitioner) and Baldev Singh, who were standing in the passage, encircled him and started beating him with intention to kill him. Paramdeep Singh gave repeated blows of *Kirch* on his waist and Baldev Singh gave *daah* blow at the back and neck of the complainant. The complainant fell unconscious at the spot. When the crowd gathered, accused fled from the spot with their respective weapons and the complainant was shifted to GMC, Sector-16, Chandigarh. It was further



alleged that the motive behind this occurrence was that accused-Baldev Singh had taken the land on lease which is adjoining to the fields of the complainant. Baldev Singh had watered the complainant's paddy crop due to which his reaped paddy got damaged. The complainant, thereafter, gave messages regarding his loss through Panchayat and since then, accused persons were threatening the complainant. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. The FIR was registered. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrested on 18.11.2024. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined to him vide order dated 06.06.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition for grant of concession of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the allegations regarding causing the injuries are against the father of the petitioner, however, the petitioner has been roped in merely on the basis of exaggerated allegations. He has contended that the complainant has left the country and presently, he is abroad thus, the incarceration of the petitioner is being prolonged. He has submitted that three material witnesses already stand examined. He has further submitted that the petitioner has not been involved in any other case and thus, he has no criminal antecedents and he prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel, has however, opposed the submissions



made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was armed with a *kirch* and the injuries caused by him to the complainant have been declared to be dangerous to life. He, on instructions, has submitted that the complainant, has presently gone abroad and the prosecution has filed an application for his examination through video conferencing. He has submitted that the application is pending adjudication and the petitioner has filed reply to the said application filed by the prosecution and is contesting the same.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner at this stage submits before this Court that he has no objection to the examination of the complainant through video conferencing. Thus, he submits that if the application filed by the prosecution before the trial Court for examination of the complainant is allowed, he has no objection.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the alleged occurrence has taken place on 14.11.2024 whereas, the FIR has been registered on 16.11.2024. Petitioner was arrested on 18.11.2024 and since then, he is behind the bars. Three material witnesses already stand examined however, injured-complainant is abroad. Learned counsel for the petitioner has already submitted before this Court that he has no objection if the complainant is examined through video conferencing. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 03 months and 13 days as on 05.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by



both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

CRM-45397-2025

Prayer in the present application is for grant of interim bail to the petitioner on medical grounds.

In view of the averments made in the application, the same has become infructuous as the main case has been decided today.

In view of the above, the present application is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous.

11.03.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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