

2026.PHHC.009698



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-62018-2025

Date of decision: 22nd January, 2026

Gurvinder Singh @ Ginda

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Aayush Gupta, Advocate and
Ms. Madhvi Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The instant one is the second petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 60 dated 11.06.2023 registered under Sections 302, 201, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Payal, District Khanna. His previous petition bearing CRM-M-22471-2024 had been dismissed vide order dated 25.07.2024.

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that ever since dismissal of the previous petition there is a drastic and substantive change in the circumstances as the complainant had not supported the prosecution version and he had not implicated the petitioner and any other accused in commission of the subject offences. Even the co-accused Pardeep Singh has

2026.PHHC.009698



been extended benefit of bail by this Court. On parity, he too deserves to be extended benefit of bail. Trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude as only 08 out of 18 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that the present one being the successive petition for grant of bail is not maintainable. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

4. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

5. The petitioner by forming membership of an unlawful assembly had allegedly assaulted the victim who had died. He is also alleged to have extended beatings to the complainant. The complainant who was the eye-witness stands examined and had not supported the prosecution version. Similarly situated co-accused has been extended benefit of bail. The above discussed facts in the considered opinion of the Court amount to substantive and drastic change in the circumstances, thereby making prayer for the petitioner to seek concession of bail is maintainable by way of filing of second petition. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the

2026.PHHC.009698



same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

6. Since the main petition has already been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

22nd January, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |