



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

116

CRM-M-41593-2025

PALWINDER SINGH ALIAS PINDA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CRM-M-47660-2025

JASWANT SINGH ALIAS SATWANT SINGH ALIAS JASSA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

Decided on : 11.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Amit Agnihotri, Advocate, and
Ms. Anju Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-41593-2025).

Mr. Manjinder Saini, Advocate, and
Ms. Jasleen Kaur, Advocate,
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-47660-2025).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

By this common order, both the aforementioned petitions,
i.e. CRM-M-41593-2025 and CRM-M-47660-2025 shall stand disposed
of.

1. **2nd Petition,** i.e. CRM-M-41593-2025 is filed by the
petitioner – Palwinder Singh alias Pinda, seeking grant of regular bail, in
case, FIR No.380, dated 31.10.2019, under Sections 302/120-B of IPC



and 25/27-54-59 of Arms Act and sections 212/216 of IPC added later on, registered at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar.

Petition, i.e. CRM-M-47660-2025 is filed by the petitioner – Jaswant Singh alias Satwant Singh alias Jassa, seeking grant of regular bail, in case, FIR No.380, dated 31.10.2019, under Sections 302/120-B of IPC and 25 of Arms Act and sections 212/216 of IPC added later on, registered at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar.

2. On the very outset, counsel for the petitioner – Palwinder Singh alias Pinda, submits that first bail petition, i.e. CRM-M-53948-2023, was disposed of, as having been withdrawn, vide order dated 14.12.2023 (Annexure P-2).

3. FIR in the present case was registered at the instance of the complainant-Charanjit Singh, stating therein that, besides a married daughter, he has a son namely Harpreet Singh @ Chintu, aged about 41 years, who also works with him.

On the day of the occurrence, at about 05:15/05:30 p.m., complainant along with his son Harpreet Singh @ Chintu and another person, namely Saurav Gaba, who works at his shop, were travelling in a car bearing registration No.PB-91-6478. They had stopped the car near the Old Rest House. Harpreet Singh @ Chintu and Saurav Gaba got down from the car to purchase something to eat. Saurav Gaba went behind the shop, whereas Harpreet Singh was standing in front of the car, while the complainant remained seated inside the vehicle.

In the meantime, three young boys arrived on a motorcycle and stopped near the son of the complainant. Two of them allegedly fired



indiscriminately at Harpreet Singh @ Chintu, as a result of which he fell down. Thereafter, all the three assailants fled from the spot on their motorcycle. Subsequently, complainant's son was taken for medical assistance, where he was declared dead.

4. As per the FIR, complainant stated that his son (since deceased) had a monetary dispute with one Parminder Singh @ Rinku and he would be able to identify the assailants, if they were produced before him. On the basis of the said suspicion, Parminder Singh @ Rinku was suspected to have conspired to get his son murdered.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that on the next day of the registration of FIR, i.e. on 01.11.2019, complainant recorded his supplementary statement wherein he named one Navpreet Singh @ Nav. However, present petitioner-Palwinder Singh @ Pinda was not named in the said supplementary statement.

6. It is further argued that petitioner-Palwinder Singh @ Pinda, while in police custody in another case bearing FIR No.35 dated 17.01.2020 registered under Sections 302/201 IPC read with Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Phillaur, made a disclosure statement regarding his alleged involvement in the present case as well. On the basis of the said disclosure statement, petitioner was arrested in the present case vide Rapat No.18 dated 20.01.2020; however, nothing was recovered from his possession.

7. Learned counsel further relies upon the disclosure statement of petitioner-Palwinder Singh @ Pinda and submits that, as per the facts disclosed by him, there was enmity between Navpreet Singh @ Nav and



Harpreet Singh @ Chintu. Navpreet Singh @ Nav had allegedly promised to pay a substantial amount of money in return for the killing of Harpreet Singh @ Chintu and had engaged the petitioner to facilitate contact between him and the assailants who had shot the deceased. It is further alleged that Navpreet Singh @ Nav paid a considerable amount of money to the petitioner and his accomplices for the commission of the said offence.

8. It is further submitted that a similar disclosure statement has also been made by petitioner-Satwant Singh @ Jaswant Singh @ Jassa.

9. Counsel for the respective petitioners jointly submit that petitioner-Palwinder Singh @ Pinda is in custody for a period of 06 years, 01 month and 11 days, whereas petitioner-Satwant Singh @ Jaswant Singh @ Jassa has remained in custody for a period of 04 years, 11 months and 22 days.

It is further submitted that out of total 33 prosecution witnesses, only 07 have been examined, so far. Thus, the culmination of the trial is likely to take a considerable amount of time.

10. Additionally, it is also argued that co-accused Kanwaljit Singh @ Kamal has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 23.08.2022 passed in CRM-M-40587-2020 and another co-accused, Gurpreet Singh @ Guri, has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 08.08.2022 passed in CRM-M-37252-2020. Similarly, co-accused, namely Ashish Arora @ Ashu @ Ashish Kumar Arora, has also been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 19.05.2020



passed in CRM-M-10681-2020. Thus, it is contended that both the petitioners also deserves to be granted the concession of bail on the ground of parity with the aforesaid co-accused, who have already been enlarged on bail.

11. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificates dated 10.03.2026 in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner – Satwant Singh alias Jaswant Singh alias Jassa has already undergone 04 years 11 months and 22 days period inside jail and petitioner – Palwinder Singh alias Pinda has already undergone 06 years 01 month and 11 days period inside jail.

12. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that both the petitioners are habitual offenders and several criminal cases are registered against them.

Keeping in view their criminal antecedents and gravity of the offence involved in the present case, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petitions.

13. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

14. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against both the petitioners, and the factors noticed here above,



including the total incarceration period undergone by both the petitioners and stage of trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to both the petitioners in the present case.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions is **allowed**. Petitioners namely Jaswant Singh alias Satwant Singh alias Jassa and Palwinder Singh alias Pinda are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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.

15. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

16. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, 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.

17. Both the petitions stand disposed of.

18. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

11.03.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**