

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:034636



111

CRM-M-49712-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision:06.03.2026

Karan Singh @ Manna

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking benefit of regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.192, dated 19.08.2024, registered under Sections 103, 115(2), 109, 125, 333, 351(2), 191(3) and 190 of the BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act (Offence under Sections 103(1), 331(8) and 351(8) of the BNS were added lateron), at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by complainant – Dilpreet Singh, alleging therein that on the night of 19.08.2024, he along with his father Lakhwinder

Singh was standing outside his house, when the present petitioner accompanied by co-accused reached there. They started using foul language with the complainant and his father. When they tried to stop them, accused Arjan Singh and Sajan Singh fired shots in the air with their pistol. The complainant tried to snatch pistol from Arjan Singh but the present petitioner opened an attack upon him by striking a blow on his head with a *datar*. His father tried to save him and then accused Arjan Singh struck a blow with his bracelet on the head of his father. On clamour being raised, the assailants fled from the spot. The complainant thereafter left for giving information to the police and on the way, he received information that the assailants entered inside his house and had fired shots again with an intent to kill the family members of the complainant. His paternal uncle Balwinder Singh, aunt Amarjit Kaur and seven years old daughter of Major Singh had sustained injuries. The complainant rushed back to his house and took the victims to the hospital.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The injured Amarjit Kaur succumbed to the injuries sustained by her. Offence under Section 103 of the BNS was added. Post mortem examination of the dead body of Amarjit Kaur and inquest proceedings were conducted. The petitioner was arrested on 10.12.2024. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. Co-accused were also arrested subsequently. Investigation now stand completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The injury that has been attributed to him is a simple one, caused with blunt weapon and the same could not have been caused with a *datar*. Co-accused, Lakhbir Singh has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, argued that the petitioner deserves to be extended the benefit of bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel while relying upon the status report has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. He was specifically named in the FIR and specific act has also been attributed to him. He was an active member of an unlawful assembly. There are chances of his committing similar offences, absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. It is, thus, stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof, injuries were inflicted on the members of the complainant party. The injuries sustained by one of the victims, namely, Amarjit Kaur had been proved fatal as she had succumbed to

the same. Some other persons were also injured in the same incident. The allegations *prima facie* reveal the factum of presence of the petitioner at the spot with a weapon and his participation in the occurrence. The petitioner has been linked to the acts attributed with the aid of Section 190 of the BNS. The part that has been attributed to him is causing of an injury on the person of complainant – Dilpreet Singh with a *datar*. However, as per the medico legal report of the injured – Dilpreet Singh, some lacerated wounds had been found on his person. All these injuries are opined to have been caused by a blunt weapon and are simple in nature. The injury on the person of the victim – Amarjit Kaur had not been attributed to the present petitioner. It is well settled proposition of law that in cases of group violence, individual roles must be specifically established, and mere presence at the scene of the crime cannot impute the same level of culpability to all accused. The absence of such specific evidence against petitioner militates against the denial of bail. A reference in this regard can be placed upon the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Ranjit Singh Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, (2011) 4 SCC 336**.

8. Keeping in view the above discussed facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner cannot be imputed the same level of culpability as compared to the assailants who had actively participated and he has made out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well

as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

06.03.2026

harjeet

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

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE