



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220

1) CRM-M-67171-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 12.02.2026

Charanjit Singh alias Channi . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

2) CRM-M-389-2026

Satnam Singh . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Dhawaljeet Dutta, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-67171-2025).

Mr. Ranbir Singh Sekhon, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-389-2026).

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-67171-2025 & CRM-M-389-2026, as both the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-67171-2025.
2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Charanjit Singh alias Channi (petitioner in CRM-M-67171-2025)	170	24.11.2024	109, 126(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 [S. 103 of BNS, 2023, added later on], 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959	Makhu	Ferozepur

Satnam Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-389-2026)	170	24.11.2024	109, 126(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023, and 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959 [S. 103 of BNS, 2023, added later on]	Makhu	Ferozepur
--	-----	------------	--	-------	-----------

3. At the outset, learned State counsel has filed two separate status reports dated 11.02.2026 in both the cases, in Court today. Same are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. Copies thereof have been handed over to the counsel for the petitioners.

4. Deceased in the present case is Gurmukh Singh and the occurrence is alleged to have taken place on 23.11.2024 at about 07:20 PM outside a dhaba. FIR was registered at the instance of the complainant – Kawalpreet Singh, who is the cousin of the deceased. The allegations, as set out in the FIR, are reproduced as under:-

“ Statement of Kawalpreet Singh son of Baljit Singh son of Jangir Singh resident of village Badia Chakia, police station Makhu, age about 24 years, Mo. No. 98558-97677 stated that I am a resident of the above address and I do electrical work in my house. My maternal uncle Lakhmir Singh son of Kakka Singh resident of village Khanna, police station Makhu, daughter Vimal Kaur is getting married on 13.12.2024. On 22.11.2024, I and my uncle's son Gurmukh Singh and my uncle's daughter Vimal Kaur went to give the wedding card to my uncle's relative Gurpreet Singh, son of Darshan Singh, resident of village Peer Mohammad, Police Station Makhu. When we returned after giving the wedding card, A/P Satnam Singh, Sona Singh, son of Jaswant Singh, resident of Peer Mohammad, stopped our motorcycle in the street a little distance from his house and Satnam Singh started asking my uncle's son Gurmukh Singh that on 15.11.2024, during the Sultanpur Lodhi fair, why did my father's last name be called as Dogar? We got into a heated argument with him about this. After pacifying him, we both went to village Khanna. Today, I and my maternal uncle's son Sarwan Singh son of Balvir Singh resident of village Khanna, Karandeep Singh son of Malkit Singh and Gurmukh Singh, we all distributed wedding cards among our relatives and stopped at the newly built Surjit Dhaba on Suda Road near village Makhu to Moga Road and were drinking tea. Scorpio stopped outside the dhaba in which Satnam Singh, Sona Singh son of

Jaswant Singh resident of Pir Mohammad and 4/5 unknown young boys got out who were carrying a kirpan, kapa, baseball and pistol. In which an unknown boy fired directly with the intention of killing my maternal uncle's son Gurmukh Singh which hit my maternal uncle's son Gurmukh Singh on the left shoulder and right leg. In this, the owner of the dhaba Balraj Singh ran to save him and the other people sitting at the dhaba. Seeing the gathering, all these people, along with their weapons, fled away a black Scorpio from the spot and took it towards Moga city. We had arranged a vehicle for my maternal uncle's son Gurmukh Singh for treatment and took him to Kalra Hospital, Makhu, where the doctor did not admit Gurmukh Singh as his condition was very bad. Then Gurmukh Singh was sent to Moga Medcity Hospital, Moga for the said treatment. His condition is serious. The reason for the enmity is that on 15.11.2024, during the Sultanpur Lodhi fair, my maternal uncle's son Gurmukh Singh and Satnam Singh, son of Jaswant Singh, resident of Pir Mohmand, had a verbal altercation. Regarding matter, this on 22.11.2024, first Satnam Singh and his brother Sona Singh had stopped Pir Mohammad and abused in us. Today, Satnam Singh, Sona Singh son of Jaswant Singh, along with Pir Mohammad, consultation with 4/5 unknown boys, opened fire with the intention of killing my maternal uncle's son Gurmukh Singh. Appropriate legal should be taken against them."

(**In the above reproduction of FIR, in place of 'left abdomen', it has been wrongly typed as 'shoulder'. The corrected version is 'left abdomen'.*)

5. Named accused in the FIR are (i) Satnam Singh (petitioner herein), who was allegedly armed with a kirpan, and (ii) Sona Singh, who was stated to be empty handed at the time of occurrence. However, the remaining 4/5 assailants were not named in the FIR.

6. Learned State counsel submits that during the course of investigation, CCTV footage was obtained from the owner of the dhaba. Upon perusal of the same, it was noticed that accused – Manjeet Singh @ Rana, who was armed with a revolver, fired shots, which resulted in injuries to the left abdomen and right leg of the deceased Gurmukh Singh, who

subsequently succumbed to the injuries.

It is further submitted that other accused persons, namely, (i) Nachhattar Singh @ Rana, armed with a baseball bat; (ii) Manjeet Singh, armed with an iron pipe; (iii) Satnam Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-389-2026), armed with a kirpan; (iv) Sona Singh, who was empty handed; and (v) Charanjit Singh @ Channi (petitioner in CRM-M-67171-2025), who was also empty handed, were present at the spot.

7. On a specific query put by the Court, it has been fairly conceded that as per the CCTV footage, none of the accused, except Manjeet Singh @ Rana, is seen inflicting any injury upon the deceased with the weapon carried by him. In this background, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, though the accused persons are alleged to have arrived together in a Scorpio vehicle, the question as to whether they shared any common intention is yet to be established during trial. It is also contended that, even the factum of all accused arriving together in the said vehicle is not conclusively established at this stage, particularly when the registration number of the Scorpio has not been mentioned in the FIR.

8. It is further noticeable that petitioner – Satnam Singh (in CRM-M-389-2026), though stated to be armed with a kirpan, has not been attributed with any specific injury, and even petitioner – Charanjit Singh @ Channi (in CRM-M-67171-2025) is stated to be empty handed.

Prima facie, it appears that both the petitioners were present at the spot; however, their direct or indirect role in the commission of the offence, particularly with regard to the fatal injuries caused to the deceased, is a matter which can be determined only after the prosecution leads its complete evidence before the trial Court.

9. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the

case, particularly the role attributed to the petitioners, nature of evidence collected so far, and the fact that both petitioners are in custody for a period of more than 01 year and 02 months, this Court is of the considered view that further incarceration of the petitioners would not serve any useful purpose. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the petitioners are found entitled to the concession of regular bail.

Accordingly, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

Petitions stand disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 12, 2026
J.Ram

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