



131

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

**CRM-M No.54648 of 2025
Date of Decision: 26.02.2026**

Jaskaur Singh @ Bhola**..... Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ***********

Present: Mr. S. S. Maini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., 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.0100, dated 30.05.2024, under Sections 302, 34, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sukhmander Singh. It was alleged that on 29.05.2024, the complainant and his son, namely, Harpreet Singh (deceased), went to the shop to buy some household goods. Son of the complainant, namely, Harpreet Singh (deceased) was standing outside the compound of the brother of complainant, namely, Jagjiwan Singh. In the meantime, Amritpal Singh armed with *musal* (iron toka) and Jashanpreet Singh @ Sema armed with



iron pipe came there and started entangled with Harpreet Singh (deceased). Amritpal Singh gave an iron toka blow to Harpreet Singh, which hit on his right arm. Harpreet Singh tried to save himself by raising his left hand, however the blow hit on his left hand. Jashanpreet Singh also gave an iron pipe blow on the complainant, which hit on his left arm. Thereafter, the son of complainant, Harpreet Singh fell down. Jaskaur Singh (petitioner) raised lalkara not to spare the son of complainant and then, the co-accused gave many blows to the deceased, Harpreet Singh. On raising alarm, all the assailants escaped from the place of occurrence. Harpreet Singh was shifted to the hospital, where he was declared dead. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 19.07.2024. Postmortem of the dead body was conducted. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 06.05.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that neither the petitioner had any motive nor he had played any active role in the alleged offence. He has submitted that as per the case of



the prosecution itself, it is evident that the petitioner was alleged to have exhorted the co-accused. He has submitted that neither the petitioner was alleged to be armed with any weapon nor he had caused any injury to the deceased or any other person from the complainant side. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of exaggerated allegations. He has further submitted that the eye-witnesses have already been examined and thus, there is no possibility of the petitioner tampering with the prosecution witnesses. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 19.07.2024. He has thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR. He has submitted that it is the petitioner, who had exhorted the co-accused and thereafter, the fatal blows were given by the petitioner to the deceased. He has submitted that the petitioner had played an active role and he was the part of unlawful assembly. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 36 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses including the eye-witnesses have been examined. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record. He has thus submitted that no case for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Heard.



6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 19.07.2024 and since then, he is behind bars. The petitioner was alleged to have exhorted the co-accused. The injuries to the deceased was alleged to the co-accused and not to the petitioner. Eye-witnesses, as submitted before this Court, have already been examined. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 07 months and 03 days as on 25.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

7. 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. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. 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.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.02.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No