



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

(111)

CRM-M-60862-2025

DATE OF DECISION: 17.02.2026

Karan Singh @ Maur

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Prabhjot Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate, for complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.112 dated 15.06.2024, under Sections 307, 452, 380, 336, 323, 427, 506, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Guruharsahai, District Ferozepur.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is in custody for the last eight months; there is a version and cross version between the parties; there is land dispute between both the parties and two other FIRs have been registered against the petitioner at the instance of complainant and his family members; the only injury attributed to petitioner is a simple injury inflicted by back side of kappa; that the kappa used by petitioner has already been recovered and nothing further remains to be recovered at the instance of petitioner; co-accused namely Bhag Singh has been granted concession of anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 04.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-32166-2025. Hence prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.



3. On behalf of State, Mr.Surinderjit Singh Nahar, AAG, Punjab, appeared and submitted that the present petitioner was part of unlawful assembly and petitioner along with co-accused caused injuries to the complainant with dangerous weapons; the petitioner inflicted a kappa blow on the elbow of the complainant. Co-accused Bhag Singh who has been granted anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench is not similarly placed as only attribution to him is that of raising lalkara. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant opposed the bail application by submitting that the petitioner was a member of unlawful assembly and along with co-accused he entered into the house of the complainant and attacked with dangerous weapons, and even fired gunshots, in which the complainant received fire arm injury. He further contended that case is fixed for prosecution evidence on 12.03.2026.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the contentions of learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant; that present petitioner is in custody for the last eight months; it is not a disputed fact that there is a version and cross version as an FIR is also registered against the complainant party and other criminal cases are also pending between both the parties as there is a land dispute between the parties, the only injury attributed to present petitioner is simple in nature, so, keeping in view the totality of the circumstances of the present case as concession of bail cannot be denied just as measure of punishment as culpability of the accused will be decided at the final stage by the trial Court

after appreciating the evidences adduced by both sides and it is trite



CRM-M-60862-2025 3

principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

8. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

17.02.2026	(SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No