



CRM-M-46701-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-46701-2025
Date of decision: 13.01.2026

SUKHJIT SINGH @ SITA

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

220

CRM-M-49873-2025

KHUSHPREET SINGH @ PRINCE

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Balpreet K.Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-46701-2025.

Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-49873-2025.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Manju Goyal, Advocate with
Mr. Pankaj Goyal, Advocate for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. In the above mentioned petitions common question of law and facts are involved, so both the petitions are being disposed of by a common judgment. For brevity, facts are being taken from CRM-M-46701-2025 titled as “*Sukhjit Singh @ Sita Versus State of Punjab.*”

2. Petitioner(s) have approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.176 dated 14.12.2024 under Sections 140(3), 109, 118(1), 115(2), 190, 191(3), 351(3), 118(2), 117(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Bathinda, District

**CRM-M-46701-2025****-2-**

3. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Manpreet Singh. On 14.12.2024 at about 01:00–01:30 p.m., while the complainant was entering DAV College, Bathinda to appear in his BA-II re-examination, he was forcibly abducted by unknown persons, pushed into a Swift Dzire car driven by Sita (known to him), and taken to 400 Acres land on Mansa Road, followed by other accused in a Verna car. At the spot, 8–10 persons including Harman, Prince, Arshi, and Rittan assaulted him with kirpans, rods, sticks, and a sprocket, causing multiple injuries and rendering him unconscious. A video was recorded by the accused, who thereafter fled after threatening him. The request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. The injured-complainant was medico legally examined. The petitioner(s) were arrested on 23.12.2023 and 23.12.2023.. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. On framing of charges, trial commenced. They approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana declined the bail applications vide orders dated 21.04.2025 and 21.07.2025. Thus, the petitioner(s) are before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petitions.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s) have vehemently contended that the petitioner(s) have been falsely implicated in the present case as the FIR was registered against the unknown persons. They submit that from the prosecution case itself, it is evident that the injury constituting the offence under Section 307 of the BNS has been attributed to the co-accused. They further submit that the co-accused, namely, Hardeep Singh @ Arshi Sran and Harmandeep Singh @

**CRM-M-46701-2025****-3-**

Court vide common order dated 19.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-36069-2025 and CRM-M-43827-2025, respectively. They further submit that the petitioner-Sukhjit Singh @ Sita was allegedly armed with a *Grari* and the alleged injury given is on the leg of the complainant whereas Khushpreet Singh @ Prince was armed with baseball bat and he hit on the ankle of the complainant. However, both the injuries were declared to be simple in nature. They further submit that the complainant has also been examined. They further submit that the petitioner(s) have no criminal antecedents and once the main accused are already on bail, thus, they deserve to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail application on the ground that the petitioner(s) were not only part of an unlawful assembly but they have actively participated in the occurrence. She further submits that they were armed with legal weapons. Hence, they do not deserve the concession of regular bail.

5. Status reports by way of affidavit of Saravjeet Singh Brar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, City-2 Bathinda, on behalf of the respondent-State already filed in the Registry is already taken on record.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He, on instructions, submits that out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only complainant has been examined so far and they are not involved in any other case. The factum regarding the bail having been granted to the co-accused, namely, Hardeep Singh @ Arshi Sran and Harmandeep Singh @ Harman has not been controverted. He has produced custody certificates of the petitioner(s) today in the Court and the same are taken on record.



CRM-M-46701-2025

-4-

8. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the co-accused against whom the allegations pertaining to the injury under Section 307 of BNS has already been enlarged on bail on 19.08.2025. The injury alleged against the petitioner was found to be simple in nature and the injured-complainant already stands examined. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioner, namely, Sukhjit Singh @ Sita has completed incarceration of 01 year and 19 days and he is not involved in any other case whereas petitioner, namely, Khushpreet Singh @ Prince has completed incarceration of 01 year and 06 days as on 12.01.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in 02 more case, however, he is on bail in one case.

9. 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. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time.

10. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner(s) succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed. Petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner in CRM-M-49873-2025 during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

13.01.2026
renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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