

2026:PHHC:032003



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

(109+119) two cases

CRM M-47626-2024  
Date of Decision : 26.02.2026

Shanti @ Senti Ram

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

CRM-M-41457-2025

Shekhar Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT**

Present:- Mr. Gaurav, Advocate for the petitioner (s).  
in CRM M-47626-2024.

Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Rajdeep Singh Gill, Advocate, for the petitioner  
in petition CRM-M-41457-2025

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Garima Sharma, Advocate, for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**N.S.SHEKHAWAT (Oral):**

1. This order shall dispose off two petitions, i.e., CRM M-47626-2024 titled as “Shanti @ Senti Ram Vs. State of Punjab” and

**CRM-M-41457-2025** titled as “**Shekhar Kumar Vs. State of Punjab**”

for grant of concession of regular bail in a case arising out of FIR No. 11 dated 19.02.2024 registered under Sections 302, 323, 325 and 34 IPC registered at Police Station Ghanaur, District Patiala.

2. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of Shekhar Kumar, (petitioner in CRM M-41457-2025), has vehemently argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case due to previous enmity. He further submits that a vague allegation has been leveled against the petitioner that he was carrying a handle of a spade and had caused injury to Anmol Kumar, since deceased, and other injured in the present case. However, from a perusal of the post-mortem report (Annexure P-2), it is evident that there was only one injury on the head of the deceased, which was attributed to Manish Kumar, co-accused, non-applicant. He further submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 19<sup>th</sup> February 2024, i.e., for almost two years, and till date, no prosecution witness has been examined so far. Learned senior counsel further contends that the case of the prosecution is based on the testimonies of related and official witnesses and he may not be in a position to temper with the witnesses.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Shanti @ Senti Ram (petitioner in CRM M-47626 of 2024) has also submitted that it has been falsely alleged that the petitioner had

caught hold of Anmol Kumar, since deceased, while the injuries were allegedly being caused to him by the other accused. In fact, in this part of the country, there is a normal tendency to involve several accused by assigning them roles of exhortation, caught hold of injured or deceased, etc. He further contends that the petitioner has already undergone more than two years of custody and the trial is not progressing at all.

5. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the State as well as the complainant have expressed the apprehension that both the petitioners may influence the witnesses of the prosecution as no witness has been examined so far. On this, counsel both the learned counsel representing the petitioners have made a statement voluntarily that both the petitioners shall not enter the jurisdiction of District Patiala (Punjab), till the conclusion of the prosecution evidence, except appearing before the trial Court on the dates of hearing.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioners and the petitioners are not entitled for the concession of regular bail. They further contend that both the petitioners have caused injuries to the other injured also.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. In the present case, it is not in dispute that the only allegation against Shanti @ Senti Ram is that he had caught hold of the deceased, whereas a general allegation has been leveled against Shekhar Kumar that he had caused injuries with a handle of a spade, however, no specific injury has been attributed to him. The prosecution is yet to lead evidence with regard to involvement of both the petitioners before the trial Court. At this stage, both the petitioners have already undergone two years of custody and the prosecution has not been able to examine even a single witness so far.

9. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned subject to the following conditions:-

*(i) The petitioners shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade them to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.*

*(ii) The petitioners shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.*

*(iii) The petitioners shall not absent themselves from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the*

*Court concerned.*

*(iv) The petitioners shall surrender their passports, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case they are not holder of the same, they shall swear an affidavit to that effect.*

*(v) The petitioners shall also file their affidavit before the concerned Court, mentioning their ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by them during the pendency of the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, they shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.*

*(vi) In case, the petitioners get involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail granted to the present petitioners.*

*(vii) The concerned Court may insist two heavy local surties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioners.*

*(viii) The petitioner shall report every 1<sup>st</sup> Monday in English calander month before the concerned SHO till the conclusion of the trial and SHO shall mark his presence by making an entry in the Rojnamcha. In case, they do not report on every 1<sup>st</sup> Monday before the concerned SHO, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession granted to them shall be liable to be cancelled and the State of Punjab shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application in this regard.*

10. Further, as agreed by the learned counsel for the petitioners, both the petitioners shall not enter the jurisdiction of District Patiala till the conclusion of the prosecution evidence. However, they shall be permitted to attend the date of hearing before the trial Court, situated in Patiala and they shall not be allowed to visit any other place in District Patiala except District Courts, Patiala. Even, both the petitioners shall not seek unnecessary adjournments before the trial Court.

11. A copy of this order be also placed on the file of connected case.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)  
JUDGE

26.02.2026  
*amit rana*

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