



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

125

CRM-M-52957-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 23.02.2026

Gurmeet Singh @ Meetu

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Sr. Advocate for  
Mr. Utkrant Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.189 dated 29.06.2023, registered under Section(s) 307, 326, 323, 324, 341, 148, 149, 201 (Sections 307, 326, 201 added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Civil Lines Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case are that:-

*“xxxxxxx on 23.06.2023 at 11:00 PM, petitioner along with co-accused armed with weapon caused injuries to Kamaljit Singh son of Daljit Singh. Petitioner is armed with dattar and gave two dattar blows on the head of injured Kanwaljit Singh. As per prosecution case one blow hit on the right side of the head and second of the left side. It is further the version of the complainant that other co-accused also caused*

*injuries.”.*

3. Short reply filed by way of affidavit dated 28.10.2025 on behalf of respondent-State is already available on file and the same is taken on record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the injured/Kanwaljit Singh, was medico legally examined and was found to have suffered 5 injuries in the occurrence. Injuries No.1 and 3 were attributed to the petitioner. While injury No.3 was declared to be simple, the opinion w.r.t. injury No.1 was that the same could have been dangerous to life, if timely treatment had not been given. He contends that the petitioner has been in custody since November-2024 and has undergone an actual custody of nearly 01 year 03 months. He submits that none out of the total 21 prosecution witnesses, has been examined so far, hence, the trial is likely to take a long time in its conclusion. He further contends that the petitioner has clean antecedents and not involved in any other criminal case.

5. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, nature of allegations levelled against him coupled with the fact that the arguable issue with respect to the nature of injuries and the offence would arise during the course of trial, the stage of the trial, his clean antecedents and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is

ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**23.02.2026**

*Mangal Singh*

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