



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

126

CRM-M-63484-2025
Date of decision: 13.03.2026

JASPAL SINGH ALIAS JASSI

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant **third petition** has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 71 dated 22.05.2021, registered under Section(s) 302, 307, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and under Section 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Charge Sheet presented under Section 302, 307, 447, 506, 511 and 34 of the IPC, 1860 and Sections 27/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959 and under Sections 181, 192 of the Motor Vehicle Act, 1988) at Police Station Mullanpur Garibdass District SAS Nagar (Mohali), after the first had been withdrawn and the second was dismissed on 12.03.2025.

2. Succinctly stated, the present FIR was lodged on the basis of the statement of the complainant Parminder Singh, who stated that he was

working as a property dealer under the name and style of “Sidu Brar” along with Balvir Singh. It was alleged that Balvir Singh had purchased land measuring 31 marlas from one of the co-sharers, namely Harjinder Singh, pursuant to which a sale deed was executed in his favour and he was placed in possession of the said land, upon which he subsequently constructed two shops. According to the prosecution, Jaspal Singh, Kulwinder Singh @ Pindu, Sehaj, and Avtar Singh @ Gholi began asserting that the said land did not belong to Balvir Singh and that they had constructed shops thereon. The complainant party, however, maintained that Harjinder Singh @ Bille had delivered possession of the land to them, on the basis of which the construction had been raised. It is further alleged that the aforesaid persons ploughed the land and removed the pillars erected thereon. As per the case set up by the prosecution while the complainant, Balvir Singh and Dilbagh Singh @ Lali were present on the said land, the accused Jaspal Singh @ Jassi, Kulwinder Singh @ Pindu, Sehaj and Avtar Singh @ Gholi arrived at the spot and extended threats. It is alleged that Kulwinder Singh @ Pindu and Jaspal Singh were armed with revolvers, while the other accused entered the fields and raised exhortations to teach the complainant party a lesson. During the course of the incident, Jaspal Singh fired from his pistol, whereafter Kulwinder Singh @ Pindu also fired towards the complainant party. One of the shots was directed at Dilbagh Singh, who managed to save himself, while another shot struck the complainant on his forehead. It is further averred that Kulwinder Singh @ Pindu fired another shot which hit Balvir Singh in the chest, causing him to fall to the ground. Thereafter, the accused persons fled from the place of occurrence while extending threats. Balvir Singh was

subsequently taken for medical treatment to PGI, Chandigarh, where he was declared brought dead by the attending doctor.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the incident in question is stated to have taken place on 22.05.2021 and the petitioner is stated to be in custody since 16.06.2021 and has already undergone an actual custody of about 4 years and 9 months. It is contended that the fatal injury to the deceased Balvir Singh as well as the injuries caused to the eye-witness, have been specifically attributed to the main accused, namely Kulwinder Singh. As regards the petitioner, the allegation is limited to the effect that he had fired a gunshot in the air, and thus, according to the prosecution version itself, no injury has been attributed to the petitioner. He contends that the trial is still at an initial stage inasmuch as only 6 out of the 26 prosecution witnesses have been examined thus far, and therefore the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. It is also contended that the petitioner does not have any other criminal antecedents.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the submissions as above.

5. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the role attributed to the petitioner, the period of custody already undergone by him, his clean criminal antecedents, as well as the stage of the trial wherein only 06 witnesses out of total 26 have been examined so far and further bearing in mind that the petitioner has already undergone actual custody of around 4 year 9 months and the trial is likely to take considerable time to reach its conclusion, I deem

it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. 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.

MARCH 13, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No