



CRM-M-59676-2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.107

CRM-M-59676-2025
Date of Decision: 20.02.2026

GURMILAP SINGH ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. ADS Jattana, Advocate and
Mr. Mandeep Singh Gill, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the second criminal petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 158 dated 31.12.2024, registered under Sections 333, 118(1), and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 (Section 118(2) added subsequently), at Police Station Sultanwind, District Amritsar.
2. Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that on 27th December 2024, complainant Sukhdev Singh stated that while he was sitting in his shop having dinner at about 9:42 p.m., Gurmilap Singh came to his house in an intoxicated condition and started abusing him. He allegedly entered into a scuffle with the complainant and thereafter went back to his house. At about 9:54 p.m., Gurmilap Singh returned armed with a kirpan along with his brother Gurbaj Singh, who was carrying a stick, and Raja, the brother-in-law of Gurbaj Singh, while Kuldeep Singh also reached the spot. Kuldeep Singh



allegedly exhorted the others to catch the complainant and teach him a lesson. Thereafter, Gurbaj Singh allegedly gave a stick blow which the complainant caught with his hand, and Gurmilap Singh allegedly struck him with the kirpan. In order to save himself, the complainant raised his hands, as a result of which the blows landed on his fingers. Raja also allegedly struck him with a stick. It is alleged that Gurmilap Singh again attacked him with the kirpan, causing injuries to his hands, from which blood started flowing, whereupon he raised alarm and all the assailants fled from the spot with their respective weapons.

3. It is further alleged that the complainant's son Lovepreet Singh reached the spot, arranged transport and took him first to the police station and thereafter to Civil Hospital, Amritsar, where his hands were bandaged and medico-legal report was prepared.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the allegation regarding injury on the left hand of injured Sukhdev Singh attributed to the petitioner is false and, in fact, the said injury appears to be self-inflicted. It is submitted that the petitioner has been behind bars since 12.01.2025 and has thus undergone custody for more than one year. It is further contended that out of twenty prosecution witnesses, only four have been examined so far, and therefore the trial is likely to take considerable time. Learned counsel submits that the injuries alleged are on non-vital parts of the body, i.e. fingers, and no injury has been attributed on any vital part. It is argued that the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation, has clean antecedents, and undertakes to abide by any condition imposed by this Court. Hence, he prays that the petitioner be released on regular bail.



5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application on the ground that serious allegations of causing grievous hurt with a sharp-edged weapon have been levelled against the petitioner, attracting the rigours of Section 326 IPC. It is submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may influence or tamper with prosecution witnesses, as several material witnesses are yet to be examined.
6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. The petitioner has remained in custody for about one year and one month, and only four out of twenty prosecution witnesses have been examined, which indicates that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Moreover, one of the co-accused has already been granted the concession of bail. Continued incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose, particularly when the trial is not likely to conclude in the near future.
7. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to his compliance with the conditions imposed under law.
8. However, it is made clear that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

20.02.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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