

CRM-M-61782-2025
CRM-M-63189-2025
CRM-M-10328-2026

1

2026.PHHC.069256



108/4+108+225 (03 cases)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CRM-M-61782-2025

Jagsir Singh @ ChakkiPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

2. CRM-M-63189-2025

Avtar Singh Dhillon @ Avtar Singh @ DhillonPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

3. CRM-M-10382-2026

Lakhwinder Singh @ PinderPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

Date of decision : 05.05.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Rajeshwar Singh, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M No.61782 of 2025.

Mr. Puneet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Mitul Singh Rana, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M No.63189 of 2025.

Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-10382-2026.
Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, D.A.G., Punjab.



Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Jatinder Kumar Kansal, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of abovesaid three petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.11 dated 05.02.2025 , under Sections 109, 125, 351(2) of BNS read with Sections 25, 27 and 54/59 of Arms Act (Sections 24, 27, 54/59 of Arms Act, deleted lateron vide DDR No.23 dated 04.04.2025), registered at Police Station Phool, District Bathinda.

3. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Gurtej Chand. It was alleged that the complainant was running dairy business and on 05.02.2025 at about 12:45 A.M., he received a phone call of Overseer alias Satnam Singh alias Satti, who threatened the complainant on pretext that the complainant was defaming him. It was alleged that thereafter, at about 2:00 A.M., while he was asleep in his house, at that time, some persons came outside his house and started hurling abuses by using filthy language. It was alleged that the complainant saw that Overseer alias Satnam Singh alias Satti, who was armed with revolvers in both hands, was firing bullets with his revolver in front of the house of the complainant and he was accompanied by two other unknown persons out of which one was armed with a sharp edged weapon like *gandasa* who was giving blows of the same on the gate of the house of complainant and the other unknown person was also armed with some weapon. It was



alleged that the said persons abused the complainant and also threatened to kill him. It was alleged that the motive behind the occurrence was that the house of complainant's nephew Lovejeet Singh and house of Satnam Singh were in the same street and his nephew has got installed cameras in front of his house and the aforesaid Satnam Singh was asking him to lower down the said cameras as the same were recording the persons visiting the house of Satnam Singh. It was alleged that due to the said reason, accused persons committed the said offence. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioners surfaced and they were also nominated as an accused in the present case vide DDR No.23 dated 16.02.2025. Resultantly, the petitioners were arrested on 17.02.2025. Petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda, praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioners-Jagsir Singh @ Chakki, Avtar Singh Dhillon @ Avtar Singh @ Dhillon and Lakhwinder Singh @ Pinder vide orders dated 04.07.2025, 05.06.2025 and 19.07.2025, respectively. Being aggrieved, petitioner-Avtar Singh Dhillon @ Avtar Singh @ Dhillon earlier petitioner has approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-15060-2025 and CRM-M-21444-2025, however, the same were dismissed as withdrawn vide orders dated 25.03.2025 and 29.04.2025, respectively. Hence, he is petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present third petition praying for grant of regular bail. However, qua petitioners, namely, Jagsir Singh @ Chakki and Lakhwinder Singh @ Pinder, this is the first petition



praying for grant of bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners have submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present FIR. It is submitted that the petitioners were not named in the FIR, however, vide DDR No.23 dated 16.02.2025, they were nominated as accused persons. It is submitted that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioners. It is submitted that even otherwise the allegation against petitioner-Jagsir Singh @ Chakki is that he was part of an unlawful assembly only; against petitioner-Avtar Singh Dhillon is that he was armed with a revolver, however, no shot had been fired from the same and petitioner-Lakhwinder Singh @ Pinder is that he was armed with a *Gandasa*, and with the same he hit the gate of the house of the complainant, however, no injury has been caused with the same. He further submits that investigation is complete and challan has already been presented and charges in the present case were framed on 16.07.2025. However, no witnesses has been examined till date. He further submits that once it is a case of version and cross-version, it is yet to be decided that which party was the aggressor. To buttress their arguments, it is submitted that though petitioner-Avtar Singh Dhillon is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in the said case and qua petitioners, Jagsir Singh and Lakhwinder Singh, they have no criminal antecedents. It is submitted thus, submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant, however, has opposed the submissions made on behalf of the petitioners and submits that the petitioners were not only armed with the deadly weapons, but also fired shots in the air. He submits that there is a CCTV footage which clearly



shows the petitioners have trespassed the house of the complainant after breaking open the doors. He submits that witnesses are yet to be examined and the next date fixed before the trial Court is 21.05.2026. He, thus, prays for rejection of bail of the present petitioners.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners and submits that petitioner, namely, Lakhwinder Singh, was armed with a *gandasa*, who had hit upon the gate of house of the complainant. He further submits that petitioner-Jagsir Singh @ Chakki was part of an unlawful assembly and petitioner-Avtar Singh Dhillon was armed with a revolver. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 23 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date including the material witnesses. He has produced on record the custody certificates of the petitioners.

7. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners were arrested on 17.02.2025 vide DDR No.23 dated 16.02.2025. The allegations against petitioner-Jagsir Singh @ Chakki is only that he was part of unlawful assembly, however, no role has been attributed to him. Though petitioners-Avtar Singh and Lakhwinder Singh, were armed with weapon and *gandasa*, however, no injury was caused to anyone. As per custody certificates, petitioners suffered an incarceration of more than 01 year as on 05.05.2026. It further reflects that though petitioner-Avtar Singh Dhillon @ Avtar Singh @ Dhillon is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case. Qua petitioners-Jagsir Singh @ Chakki and Lakhwinder Singh @ Pinder, they have no criminal antecedents. Admittedly, it is a case of version and cross-version and it would lie within the domain of trial Court to assess



that which party was the aggressor. Out of total 23 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far.

8. 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.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, all the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their 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.

05.05.2025
ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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