



CRM-M-67933-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

127

CRM-M-67933-2025

Decided on :18.03.2026

Kuldeep Lal Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Bhriugu Dutt Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.261 dated 31.08.2025, under Sections 109, 121, 132, 221, 324(4), 351(2) BNS (formerly Section 307, 332, 353, 186, 427, 506 IPC), registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.
2. Complainant-ASI Charanjit Singh, got FIR registered in the present case, which reads as under:

“ Statement of ASI Charanjit Singh Belt No.578/Jalandhar son of Late S. Santokh Singh resident of Village Baddo, Tehsil Garhshankar, District Hoshiarpur aged about 57 years. Stated that I am resident of the above said address and I am on night duty at ERS (Zebra-19). ASI Mangu Ram No.137/CP.JAL is posted alongwith me. On 30.08.2025 at about 10:30 PM, a call was received at 112 Police Control Room Jalandhar informing that a fight is taking place in Mohalla Upkar Nagar, Street

**CRM-M-67933-2025****2**

No.2 Police Station Rama Mandi Jalandhar and direction was issued to reach at the spot. On receiving the information, we reached at the spot, where we met Kuldeep Lal son of Mukhtiar Ram in the street. On being asked about the fight, he informed that he has a dispute with his wife. On this we went to the house of Kuldeep Lal. We tried to pacify him. Kuldeep Lal got enraged and started abusing us. Then he at once came ahead and tore the collar of my uniform and pushed me and threw me on the ground. ASI Mangu Ram came forward to save me. In the meantime, Kuldeep Lal ran inside and said that he will apprise us so to who he is. Kuldeep Lal immediately after coming out from inside, with an intention to kill, gave two blows on the head of ASI Mangu Ram with a dagger held in his hand. ASI mangu Ram due to deep injuries on his head started bleeding and fell on the ground. When I tried to stop Kuldeep Lal, he tried to attack me also. Thereafter, he ran outside. Kuldeep Lal damaged front tyre of Zebra-19 vehicle with the dagger so that police party cannot catch hold of Kuldeep Lal while running away. Kuldeep Lal escaped from the spot while hurling abuses. I immediately informed police control room and Zebra-16 vehicle reached the spot and the officials of Zebra-16 vehicle took ASI Mangu Ram in the vehicle to the hospital for treatment. I have come present before you in the police station. I have got recorded my statement. I have read and heard the same. It is correct. Action as per law may be taken. Sd/-. Charanjit Singh 81460-00578. Attested. Sd/-. Manjinder Singh SI/SHO Police Station Control Room, Rama Mandi, Jalandhar Commissionerate. Dated 31.08.2025.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that a concocted version has been introduced in the FIR by the police officials themselves, by fabricating a story that petitioner was not on good terms with his

**CRM-M-67933-2025****3**

wife and that the police officials had visited his residence to pacify the dispute. Thus, Mr. Bhrigu Dutt Sharma, Advocate, argues that, admittedly, the alleged incident took place at the house of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the factual assertion in the FIR regarding the petitioner not being on good terms with his wife is wholly concocted, and has been introduced solely to justify the presence of the police officials at his residence. Learned counsel argues that the police officials themselves were involved in the incident, having visited the petitioner's house with an ulterior motive, and thereafter foisted the present case upon him.

5. On a query raised by this Court, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, Neetu is the name of petitioner's wife; however, she does not figure in the list of witnesses. Counsel for the petitioner submits that even in the challan, her name has not been mentioned in the list of witnesses. Thus, the reason stated in the FIR for the police officials visiting the house of the petitioner is asserted to be wholly false.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that not a single injury has been declared as grievous or dangerous to life; rather, all the injuries have been found to be simple in nature.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 31.08.2025, i.e., for a period of last 06 months and 14 days, thus prays for the grant of bail.

8. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that petitioner is involved in a serious offence, as he allegedly tore the police

**CRM-M-67933-2025****4**

uniform and caused injuries to the police officials. Therefore, prays for dismissal of present petitioner.

9. However, learned State counsel is unable to justify the reason for the police officials/injured officials reaching the house of the petitioner, that too without recording any statement of the petitioner's wife.

10. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book along with the documents appended thereto.

11. Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, particularly the contention regarding the doubtful version put forth in the FIR; the absence of the petitioner's wife (Neetu) from the list of witnesses; the inability of the State to justify the presence of the police officials at the petitioner's residence; the nature of injuries having been opined to be simple; and the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 31.08.2025; this Court finds merit in the prayer made by the petitioner.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.



CRM-M-67933-2025

5

13. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

18.03.2026

Rashmi

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