



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

128

1) CRM-M-68155-2025
Decided on : 19.02.2026

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

2) CRM-M-67467-2025

Sumandeep Singh @ Shaunki . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-68155-2025).

Mr. Mikhail Kad, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-67467-2025).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. P.S. Grewwal, Advocate and
Mr. Vishal Tartyal, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-68155-2025 & CRM-M-67467-2025, as both the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-68155-2025.
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
--------------------------	------------	------	------------	----------------	----------

Sunny Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-68155- 2025)	266	21.10.2025	109, 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023	Bhawanigarh	Sangrur
Sumandeep Singh @ Shaunki (petitioner in CRM-M-67467- 2025)	266	21.10.2025	109, 126(2), 115(2), 117(2), 351(2), 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023	Bhawanigarh	Sangrur

3. A few facts necessary for adjudication of the cases may be noticed.

Complainant/injured – Karanvir Singh got registered the aforementioned FIR alleging that he was caused injuries by the accused persons, namely, (i) Jagsir Singh @ Matendo, (ii) Sukhdeep Singh @ Prince, (iii) Sunny @ Nepali, (iv) Arshdeep Singh, (v) Sarup, (vi) Karan @ Gaira, (vii) Shonki, and 2/3 unknown persons, who had intercepted the vehicle of the injured and inflicted injuries upon them. Accused – Sunny Singh and Sumandeep Singh @ Shaunki are the petitioners herein.

4. Role assigned to both the petitioners, as mentioned in the status reports dated 16.02.2026, today filed in Court by learned State counsel in both cases separately, is reproduced here-under:-

Petitioner – Sunny Singh (in CRM-M-68155-2025):-

“11. ROLE OF THE PETITIONER

That petitioner is directly involved in the present FIR No. 266 dated 21.10.2025 under section 109, 126 (2), 115 (2), 351 (2), 351 (3), 191(3), 190 BNS P.S Bhawanigarh and following injuries have been attributed to victims are as under:-

- 1. Petitioner Sunny alias Nepali given blow of his baseball on left knee of victim Karanvir Singh.*
- 2. Petitioner Sunny alias Nepali gave blow with stick on left hand of Haramdeep Singh.*
- 3. Petitioner Sunny alias Nepali gave blow of baseball on left ankle of Gangandeep Singh.*

12. EVIDENCE AGAINST THE PETITIONER

On the basis of the statement of victim Karanvir Singh the present petitioner is nominated in the present FIR and injuries are attributed as per the MLR'S of the victims.

13. CRIMINAL ANTECEDENTS

That as per the perusal of the police record apart from the present FIR one more FIR 51 dated 06.03.2022 u/s 323, 341, 506, 34 IPC PS Bhawanigarh was registered against the petitioner."

Petitioner – Sumandeep Singh @ Shaunki (in CRM-M-67467-2025):-

"10. ROLE OF PETITIONER

That petitioner is directly involved in the present FIR No. 266 dated 21.10.2025 under section 109, 126 (2), 115 (2), 351 (2), 351 (3), 191(3), 190 BNS P.S Bhawanigarh and following injuries have been attributed to victims are as under:-

- 1. Petitioner Sumandeep Singh alias Shaunki has inflicted one injury with danda on left knee to Harmandeep Singh.*
- 2. Petitioner Sumandeep Singh alias Shaunki has inflicted one injury with danda on nose of Gagandeep Singh.*

In this way the petitioner attributed injuries to victim as mentioned above.

11. EVIDENCE AGAINST THE PETITIONER

The present petitioner is nominated in the present FIR and injuries are attributed as per the MLR'S of the citims.

12. CRIMINAL ANTECEDENTS

That as per the perusal of the police record apart from the present case there is no such criminal case registered against the petitioner."

5. There are three injured in the present case, namely, (i) Karanvir Singh, (ii) Gagandeep Singh, and (iii) Harmandeep Singh. None of them has suffered any injury which can be termed as grievous or dangerous to life. The nature of injuries is as under:-

- *MLR of Karanvir Singh reflects three injuries caused with blunt edged weapon. All the injuries, however, were found to be simple.*
- *MLR of Gagandeep Singh reflects six injuries caused with blunt edged weapon, which were declared simple in nature.*
- *MLR of Harmandeep Singh reflects two injuries caused with blunt edged weapon, which were found to be simple.*

6. In view of the above, learned State counsel is unable to satisfactorily explain as to on what basis offence under Section 109 of BNS, 2023 has been invoked in the present case, particularly when all the other offences are triable by the Court of learned Magistrate.

However, he attempted to submit that since a rod bearing garari was allegedly used for causing injuries on vital parts of the body, the intention of the accused has been inferred by the investigating agency, and thus, provisions of Section 109 of BNS, 2023 have been attracted.

7. This Court does not deem it appropriate to express any conclusive opinion at this stage with regard to the applicability of Section 109 of BNS, 2023, as the same would be a matter for adjudication during trial. However, considering the overall circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that all the injuries attributed to the petitioners are simple in nature, and that the trial has not yet commenced, this Court finds that further detention of the petitioners would not serve any useful purpose.

Consequently, 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.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any

threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. 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.

10 **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 19, 2026

J.Ram

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