



128

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

CRM-M No.40459 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 26.02.2026

Sandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. S. S. Salar, Advocate and
Mr. Hitesh Chugh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Ms. Amarinder Kaur, Advocate
for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

CRM-29024-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-40459-2025

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0079, dated 04.05.2024, under Sections 307, 323, 341, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Nabha, District Patiala.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Gurmit Singh. It was alleged that on 30.04.2024, at about 06:15 P.M., the complainant was at a little distance from the house of Sandeep Singh, i.e. the petitioner, who was holding a stick in his hand. Sandeep Singh waylaid



him and hit him with the stick on the head of the complainant. Thereafter, father of the petitioner, namely, Gurjit Singh also came there and after taking out the stick from the hands of Sandeep Singh, he gave blow of the same on the legs of complainant. Sandeep Singh, i.e. the petitioner, who claimed himself to be Amritpal Singh, then hit on the neck and below both the eyes of the complainant with a heavy iron bracelet, which he was wearing. After gathering of crowd and on causing injuries, both escaped from the place of occurrence with their weapons and threatened the complainant. The complainant was shifted to the hospital for treatment. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The complainant was initially admitted in the Civil Hospital, Nabha where he was medico legally examined and after his discharge from the Civil Hospital, he was again medico legally examined in Mani Pal Hospital, Patiala. The petitioner was arrested on 08.03.2025. 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, Patiala 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, Patiala dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 17.04.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

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 petitioner has been alleged to have given a stick blow and blow of heavy iron bracelet. He has submitted that admittedly there are



no allegations against that petitioner that he premeditated the act or he was armed with any lethal weapon. He has submitted that initially there was no offence under Section 307 IPC and it is after about 10 months, on seeking the opinion, the offence under Section 307 IPC has been added only to increase the gravity of the offence. To buttress his arguments, he has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 08.03.2025, however, there is no material progress in the trial. He has thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant on the other hand has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that in a premeditated manner, the complainant was attacked by the petitioner. She has submitted that the complainant remained admitted in the hospital and the ocular version is duly medically corroborated. She has submitted that the injury suffered by the complainant was declared dangerous to life.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that though the offence under Section 307 IPC was not added in the FIR initially, however on seeking the opinion of the Doctor of Civil Hospital on 24.02.2025, the offence under Section 307 IPC was added. He, on instructions, has submitted that the examination in chief of the complainant has already been recorded. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record,

it is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case has taken place on 30.04.2024. The complainant was medico legally examined on the very same day, however on the opinion of the doctor taken on 24.02.2025, the offence under Section 307 IPC has been added. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 08.03.2025. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 11 months and 16 days as on 25.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Examination in chief of the complainant has already been recorded.

8. 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.

9. 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.

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

26.02.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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