



CRM-M-41868-2025

-1-

227-2 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-41868-2025
Date of decision: 15.01.2026

JAGJIT SINGH

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Ankur Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.76, dated 12.06.2024, under Sections 307, 148, 149 of IPC read with Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran.
2. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Palwinder Singh. It was alleged that on 11.06.2024 at about 7:00 PM while he and his brother were placing soil on pathway, Sewak Singh, Saraj Singh, Harwinder Singh armed with pistol, Lovepreet Singh armed with pistol, Jagjit Singh armed with datar, Amritpal armed with pistol, Yadwinder Singh armed with pistol, Gurmeet Singh armed with pistol, Kishwar Singh armed with pistol and Baba armed with pistol along with 20/25 unknown persons came there. The dispute took place and the accused who were armed with pistol, started firing gunshots indiscriminately. Jagjit Singh



gave datar blow on the left arm of Kulwinder Singh. On raising the alarm, all of them escaped. The request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. The cross version in the present case was also lodged. On the registration of the FIR and cross-version, investigation commenced. The injured were medico legally examined. During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 12.06.2024. The cross case was sent for cancellation, however, the same is pending approval of the senior officer. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. On framing of charges, trial commenced. He approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran declined the bail application vide order dated 03.03.2025. Thus, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner had been alleged to be armed with datar and he had allegedly given the blow of the same on the head of Kulwinder Singh. He further submits that the injury was found to be grievous. He further submits that petitioner is behind bars since 12.06.2024 and has no criminal antecedents. Thus, in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that petitioner was not only present at the time of occurrence rather he was duly armed with datar and caused injury to Kulwinder Singh which was found to be grievous in nature. He, on instructions, submits that out of 24 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been



examined so far. He further submits that though, the cross case has been registered, however, the same was recommended to be cancelled but pending approval of the senior officer. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the present case is a case of version and cross-version, though, the cross case has been sent for cancellation. The petitioner was not armed with any fire arm weapon but he was armed with datar. The alleged injury was found to be grievous in nature. The offence under Section 307 IPC is alleged against the co-accused and not against the petitioner. The complainant has also been examined. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year, 06 months and 30 days as on 14.01.2026 and petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of 24 prosecution witnesses, only 03 have been examined so far.

7. 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.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the custody and the stage of the trial, 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 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. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the



CRM-M-41868-2025

-4-

concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

15.01.2026
renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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