



CRM-M-40018-2025

1

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

228

CRM-M-40018-2025

Decided on :18.02.2026

Sarabjit Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. B.S. Sewak, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Ms. Raageshwari Sharma, Advocate for the victim/injured.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in connection with FIR No. 49 dated 05.07.2024, under Sections 109, 3(5), 115(2), 304, 132, 61(2), 221, 118(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Division No.2, Ludhiana.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, two Nihangs surrounded Sandeep Thapar with their naked swords and inflicted injuries on his head, arms, and legs with the intention to kill him. Accused were calling each other by the names Jota, Saba, and Laddi.

It is submitted that the accused referred to as Saba is the petitioner-Sarabjit Singh, who has filed the instant bail petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case, and no purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for a longer period. Petitioner is in custody for approximately one year, seven months, and five days.

**CRM-M-40018-2025****2**

During the medical examination of Sandeep Thapar, a total of eight injuries were observed on his person, two of which were on the head and were declared grievous in nature. Out of a total of 35 prosecution witnesses, only five have been examined till date.

4. On the previous date of hearing, i.e., 20.01.2026, proceedings were deferred for recording the statements of the complainant-Sukhwant Singh, and injured-Sandeep Thapar, who subsequently appeared before the Court and deposed in support of the prosecution's case. The completion of the statements of the remaining prosecution witnesses is likely to consume considerable time. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, as well as counsel for the complainant, submit that two grievous injuries were observed on the head of the injured.

6. However, it is not the case of the prosecution, nor does it appear from the status report, that there is any specific medical opinion indicating that the injuries were dangerous to life.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book as well as the documents appended thereto.

8. Considering the period for which the petitioner is in custody, i.e., approximately one year and seven months, and the fact that out of a total of 35 prosecution witnesses only 05 have been examined so far, it is evident that the trial is proceeding at a slow pace. Having regard to the

**CRM-M-40018-2025****3**

circumstances discussed above, including the completion of statements of the material prosecution witnesses, petitioner being a first-time offender, and the absence of any allegation of involvement in other criminal cases, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of the petitioner for grant of bail.

Consequently, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

18.02.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No