



107

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

**CRM-M-34524-2026
DECIDED ON: 01.07.2026**

**PALWINDER SINGH @ PARMINDER SINGH PATWARI
.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

**STATE OF PUNJAB
.....RESPONDENT**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. Harpreet Maini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, for grant of interim bail for a period of thirty days, in case, FIR No.50 dated 02.08.2023 registered under sections 302, 120-B, 148, and 149 of IPC [corresponding to sections 103, 61(2), 191, 190 of BNS) (sections 24/54/59 of Arms Act, sections 212, 216 of IPC (corresponding to sections 249, 253 of BNS) added later on, vide DDR No.44 dated 14.08.2023) [section 34 IPC (corresponding to section 3(5) of BNS) added later on vide DDR No.41 dated 25.10.2023] at Police Station Bariwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner's wife is scheduled to undergo a total knee replacement surgery, following which she would require complete bed rest along with round-the-clock care and assistance.

It is contended that petitioner's mother is a senior citizen aged about 65 years and is not in a position to take care of her daughter-in-law during the post-operative period. It is further submitted that petitioner's son is a minor, aged about 12 years, and is also incapable of attending to the post-operative needs of his mother. Consequently, there

is no other family member available to look after the petitioner's wife during this critical period, and petitioner alone can provide the necessary care and assistance.

3. Petitioner is in custody since 14.08.2023. It is noticed that petitioner had earlier filed CRR-2284 of 2025, which was dismissed as withdrawn, vide order dated 11.11.2025 (Annexure P-4). Petitioner had also filed CRM-M-26462 of 2025 seeking the concession of regular bail, which came to be dismissed, vide order dated 06.02.2026 (Annexure P-5).

4. In the considered opinion of this Court, requirement of a total knee replacement surgery is not shown to have arisen on account of any sudden or unforeseen circumstance. Rather, such a medical condition appears to have existed for some time. Significantly, no such ground was urged by the petitioner while seeking regular bail in CRM-M-26462-2025, which was dismissed by this Court, vide order dated 06.02.2026 (Annexure P-5). In these circumstances, this Court does not find any fresh or exceptional ground warranting concession of interim bail to the petitioner. **Accordingly, present petition is dismissed.**

01.07.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>