



CRM-M-64828-2025

-1-

**130 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-64828-2025**

Date of Decision: 11.03.2026

Kuldeep Singh @ Lovely

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Utkraant Mahajan, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.77 dated 15.03.2024, registered under Sections 302, 323, 324, 216, 212, 148, 149, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Civil Lines, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.
2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Gurdeep Singh. It was alleged that he is a truck driver and has two sons and one daughter. On 14.03.2024 at about 09:00 p.m., his elder son, namely, Hasandeep Singh (since deceased) aged about 24 years, went to feed the dog in the Haveli and after some time, the complainant also went behind him. At about 09:30 p.m., 3-4 young men armed with *datar*, *Kirpan* and *Kirch* came in front of his Haveli and thereafter, 15-20 other young men also came there. When his son came out of the house, the said persons started talking with him and in the meantime, one persons gave *kirch* blow on the chest of his son. When the complainant came forward to rescue him, then one person gave *kirpan* blow on back side of his head. Subsequently, on another person gave *datar* blow on the back side of left shoulder of the complainant, due to the injuries



received, they both fell down. They were shifted to Civil Hospital, Batala, however, his son Hasandeep Singh succumbed to the injuries on the way. It was alleged that the persons, who attacked the complainant and his son were Shankar and Munshi. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and he was arrested on 13.04.2024. On completion of investigation, the challan was presented and the on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur 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 petitioner vide order dated 23.10.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has contended that the alleged occurrence took place on 14.03.2024. He submits that neither the petitioner is named in the FIR, nor any role has been attributed to him. However, on the basis of alleged secret information on 15.03.2024, the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused in the present case. He submits that hereinafter, supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded, where the petitioner has been alleged to have given *datar* blow on the left shoulder of the complainant. He submits that the fatal injuries to the deceased, namely, Hasandeep Singh, has been attributed to co-accused Shankar, who has allegedly given a kirch blow on



the chest of the deceased. He submits that there are material contradiction in the statements made by the complainant. He contends that co-accused, namely, Naresh Kumar @ Bau, Gurpreet Singh @ Prince and Daljit Singh @ Sahab, have already been granted bail by this Court vide common order dated 22.07.2025. It is contended that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last more than 1½ years and the complainant is also examined before the trial Court. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that complicity of the petitioner was surfaced during the investigation and he was found to have played an active role in the commission of offence. He submits that the petitioner was armed with *datar* and caused injuries to the complainant. However, he submits that the injuries attributed to the petitioner were declared to be simple. He submits that the petitioner with common intention with co-accused committed murder of Hasandeep Singh. On instructions, he submits that out of total 29 prosecution witnesses, 01 witness i.e. the complainant, has been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused during the investigation. As per the case of the prosecution, the deceased suffered three injuries, whereas, the complainant suffered two injuries. The fatal injuries to the deceased have been attributed to the co-accused, namely, Shankar. The petitioner has been alleged to have given *datar* blow on the shoulder of the



CRM-M-64828-2025

-4-

complainant, which were declared to be simple in nature. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 10 months & 19 days as on 10.03.2026. It further shows that though the petitioner is involved in two other cases, however, he has been acquitted in one case. Out of total 29 prosecution witnesses, one witness i.e. the complainant has already been examined.

6. 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. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

11.03.2026
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No