



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

**CRM-M-59626-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 01.04.2026**

**Jaspal Singh**

**.....Petitioner**

**versus**

**State of Punjab**

**.... Respondent**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Ankur Jain, 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.47 dated 20.04.2025, under Sections 109, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25/27/29(B)/30 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Khemkaran, Tehsil and District Tarn Taran, Punjab.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of complainant-Nirmal Singh. It was alleged that on 20.04.2025 at about 07:30 PM, when he along with his brother Hardeep Singh, nephew Harpal Singh were present at grain market in Khemkaran, Jaspal Singh (present petitioner) intentionally drove his trolley over the wheat crop of Hardeep Singh. Upon objection, he called his brother Jugraj Singh and father Roop Singh to the spot along with weapons. Thereafter, Jaspal Singh fired shot from his .315 bore rifle at Harpal Singh, which hit his right leg near the knee, Jugraj Singh also fired shot from a .32 bore revolver, injuring Hardeep Singh. Thereafter, all the accused fled away from the spot along with their respective weapons. The injured were taken



to Civil Hospital, Khemkaran and later referred to Tarn Taran. Request was made to take legal action against the accused. Thus, the FIR was registered and petitioner was arrested on the same day i.e. 20.04.2025. The investigation commenced. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented and charges were framed. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Principal District & Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, praying for grant of bail, however, after hearing counsel for the parties and finding no merits, the same was declined vide order dated 04.10.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner is alleged to have fired shots and similar role was attributed to the co-accused namely, Jugraj Singh, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 16.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-51064-2025. He has further submitted that petitioner is behind the bars since the date of his arrest. He has also submitted that the petitioner was falsely implicated in one more FIR No.23/2016, under Sections 323, 326 IPC at Police Station Khem Karan, however, he is on bail in the same. He submits that investigation is complete, challan has been presented, charges have been framed however, out of 18 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Status report dated 19.03.2026 by way of affidavit of Mr. Preetinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division



Valtoha, Camp at Bhikhiwind, District Tarn Taran, filed by learned State counsel, is already taken on record.

5. Learned State counsel vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is the main accused in the present case as he intentionally drove his trolley over the wheat crop of the complainant party, thereby, provoking the quarrel and thereafter, called his co-accused, namely Jugraj Singh and Roop Singh to the spot with weapons. He has further submitted that it is the petitioner who after receiving .315 bore rifle from his father, fired a direct shot with intention to kill, which struck the injured Harpal Singh near his right knee. He has submitted that the role attributed to the petitioner is grave and distinct. He, on instructions, submits that though the charges have been framed however, out of 18 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case has taken place on 20.04.2025. As contended by learned counsel for the petitioner, the role of the petitioner is similar to co-accused, namely, Jugraj Singh, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 16.09.2025. Custody certificate filed by the State would show that the petitioner has undergone incarceration of 11 months and 07 days as on 31.03.2026. It further reflects that though the petitioner is involved in one more case.

7. 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 case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the 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.

8. If the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

01.04.2026  
*m.sharma*

( RAJESH BHARDWAJ )  
JUDGE

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