

117

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

CRM-M-47447-2025

Date of decision : 17.03.2026

Kamaljeet Singh @ Kanwaljit Singh @ SadhiPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Abhaysher Singh, 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.10 dated 19.01.2024, under Sections 324, 323, 34, 506, 341 of the IPC, 1860 (Section 307 of IPC added later on vide report No.59 dated 06.03.2024), registered at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Gurpreet Singh @ Vicky alleging that on 13.01.2024, he was standing opposite to Edward Ganj Hospital, Malout on his rehri. At about 07:00 PM, Kanwaljit Singh @ Sadhi (present petitioner) and Joban Singh came on motorcycle driven by Joban Singh. They used to come to his rehri to eat Rasgullas. At that time, Kanwaljit Singh @ Sadhi and Joban Singh were in inebriated condition and they started creating ruckus. The complainant advised both of them not to do so as it affect his customers. Kanwaljit Singh @ Sadhi and Joban Singh threatened to eliminate him. Out of fear, the complainant started



returning to his house after wrapping his stall and at about 08:00 PM, when he reached near his house, Kanwaljit Singh @ Sadhi and Joban Singh stopped him by blocking his way by parking their motorcycle. Joban Singh after alighting from the motorcycle started beating him. The complainant raised an alarm, which attracted his father Ved Parkash. Kanwaljit Singh @ Sadhi took the *kapa* hanging on the side of motorcycle. Joban Singh grappled him. Meanwhile, Kanwaljit Singh @ Sadhi gave *kapa* blow, which hit on the left side of his head and then Kanwaljit Singh @ Sadhi gave another *kapa* blow from its reverse side, which hit on his left shoulder. After inflicting injuries, both the accused fled away from the spot along with their respective weapons. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. The FIR was registered. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrested on 24.08.2024. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner approached the learned Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined to him vide order dated 11.11.2024. Thereafter, petitioner again approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge-cum-Vacations Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, however, the same was also dismissed vide order dated 19.06.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition for grant of concession of regular bail.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the alleged occurrence has taken place on 13.01.2024. He submits that the complainant-injured was medico-legally examined and as



per the opinion of the Doctor, it was opined that the alleged injury was declared grievous which may endanger his life. He submits that whether the offence under Section 307 IPC is made out or not is debatable. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He contends that the complainant-injured has already been examined thus, there is no probability of the petitioner influencing the injured. Hence, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner had played a specific role in the alleged occurrence. He submits that the petitioner was armed with *kapa* and the blows of the same was given on the head and shoulder of the complainant. He submits that the injury was declared to be dangerous to life. He further submits that the intention to commit the offence is clearly made out. He, on instructions, submits that out of 22 prosecution witnesses, 02 witnesses including the complainant have been examined till date. He submits that the co-accused has already been granted bail. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in this case on 24.08.2024. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that the petitioner has undergone incarceration of 1 year, 6 months and 19 days as on 16.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. The injured-complainant has already been examined. As contended by counsel for the petitioner, whether the offence



under Section 307 IPC is made out or not is a matter of trial.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after 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 cases will take sufficiently long time. However, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, 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 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

17.03.2026
m.sharma

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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