



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214

CRM-M-59419-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.01.2026

Jagtar Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. K.S. Lakhanpal, Advocate for the complainant.

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.99 dated 25.10.2023, registered under Section(s) 323, 324, 506, 148, 149, 326, 302, 201 (Sections 326, 302, 201 added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sadar Kapurthala, District Kapurthala.

2. At this stage, Mr. K.S. Lakhanpal, Advocate enters appearance and files vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant and the same is taken on record.

3. The FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Sonia Gill, the same reads thus:-

“.....Stated that I am resident of above address and do household work. My marriage was solemnized with Vinod Kumar son of Surinder Singh R/o Khakewala District



Ferozepur in 2017 and one boy namely Parmish (six) was born. I was having dispute with my husband due to which I alongwith my son for the past two years am living at my father Surinder Lal's house. On 24.10.2023 at about 10:00 PM Bobby son of Kalu Resident of village Pakhowal was abusing my uncle's (chacha) son Ravinder Singh @ Judge son of Joginder Singh. I and my father Surinder Lal came outside and Jassa son of Amrik Singh @ Mika having sword, Harjinder Singh @Jinder having datar, Lovepreet Singh @ Shintu son of Kuldeep Singh having datar, Gurbaj Singh @ Baaj empty handed, Bobby son of Kalu having datar, Jagtar Singh son of Sarban Singh empty handed, Billa wife of Kuldeep Singh @Keepa empty handed and Kuldeep Singh @ Keepa son of unknown having gandasi all R/o village Pakhowal and alongwith them 3/4 unknown persons whose names I do not know but can identify on coming before me were present. Jagtar Singh raised a lalkara saying that catch hold of them and teach them a lesson for helping Ravinder. In the meantime, Bobby attacked me with his datar which hit a little above the wrist of my right hand. Jinder attacked me with his datar which hit on the wrist of my right hand. In the meantime, my father came forward to save me and Gurbaj Singh @ Baaj caught hold of my father and Lovepreet Singh hit his datar on the head of father on the back side of the head. I tried to rescue my father when Jagga son of Mika



attacked me with reverse side of his sword which hit on the palm of my left hand. In the meantime Kuldeep Singh @ Keepa hit my father with his gandasi which hit him below the left elbow. Billa wife of Kuldeep Singh caught hold of me from my hair and threw me on the ground and gave kick blows to me. We raised alarm Mar ditta Mar Ditta upon which my aunt (chachi) Asha wife of Jasbir and other people gathered and accused on seeing them fled away from the spot with their weapons while giving threats to kill us. My aunt Asha arranged for a vehicle and got me admitted to Civil Hospital, Kapurthala. Then due to excessive injuries my father was referred to a Higher Hospital at Jalandhar. I am under treatment at Civil Hospital, Kapurthala. Cause of fight is that these persons were having quarrel with my uncle's son Ravinder Singh. I have given my statement in presence of my aunt's (Massi) son Jaswinder Singh son of Sohan Singh resident of Pakhowal. I have given my statement and read and heard the same. It is correct. Action be taken.....”.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the allegations set out in the FIR and corroborated during the course of investigation, the only allegation against the petitioner is that he exhorted other persons to open the attack. It is contended that despite conclusion of investigation, the petitioner has been in custody since 08.01.2024. He contends that there is no evidence which attributes any specific injury



inflicted by the petitioner either to the deceased or the complainant/injured eye witness. It is contended that co-accused Bovy, who was attributed an injury to the eye-witnesses has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 14.05.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-52708-2024 titled as 'Bovy Vs. State of Punjab'. Counsel further contends that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case and that out of 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

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

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant vehemently contends that there were multiple injuries on the person of the deceased, however, he is not in a position to refer to any material on the basis whereof it may be said that the case of the petitioner is at a lower footing as compared to co-accused/Bovy, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 14.05.2025 passed by this Court in CRM-M-52708-2024 and co-accused/Harjinder Singh @ Jinder @ Baljinder Singh, to whom the concession of regular bail has also been granted by this Court vide order dated 11.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-44112-2025 titled as 'Harjinder Singh @ Jinder @ Baljinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab'. Both the said accused had been specifically attributed injuries to the eye-witness.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the actual period of custody undergone by the petitioner, the attribution, absence of any injury to the deceased, young age of 21 years of



214

CRM-M-59419-2025 (O&M)

the petitioner, the stage of the trial wherein no prosecution witness has been examined so far 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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

19.01.2026
Mangal Singh

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