



CRM-M-71574-2025

-1-

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

129**CRM-M-71574-2025**

Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

Jagtar Singh @ Gocha

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

120b**CRM-M-46550-2025**

Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

Sarabjeet Singh @ Sarba

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.Sant Pal Singh Sidhu, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Deepdaman Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. By this order, the two above-mentioned petitions are disposed of, both having arisen out of the same FIR.
2. Prayer in the present petitions is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in a case FIR No.107 dated 02.11.2024, registered under Section 103, 109, 126(2), 238, 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Sangat, District Bathinda.
3. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Avtar Singh. It was alleged that he is an agriculturist and his son Gagandeep Singh (since deceased) aged about 25 years, also work with him. On 01.11.2024, at about 09:00 p.m., his son went to Mandeep Singh @ Gorkha for asking about the paddy



harvesting machine. When his son, Gagandeep Singh, did not return home for a long time, he went out to look for him and reached near the house of Mandeep Singh @ Gorkha to inquire about his son. Then he saw that Kuldeep Singh @ Preeti armed with revolver, Sukhpal Singh @ Sukha, Sarabjit Singh @ Sarba (petitioner in CRM-M-46550-2025), Sukhpal Singh @ Pala Conductor and Jagtar Singh @ Gocha (petitioner in CRM-M-71574-2025) alongwith 10-12 unknown persons were standing there. They all raised *lalkara* and then Kuldeep Singh @ Preeti fired shot directly at his son Gangdeep Singh with intention to kill him due to which he fell down on the ground. Kuldeep Singh @ Preeti fired more shots with his revolver and thereafter, they all ran away from the spot with their weapon. The complainant shifted his injured son to Civil Hospital, Bathinda from where he was referred to Adesh Hospital, Bhuchio. However, during treatment, he succumbed to the injuries. It was alleged that motive behind the occurrence was a minor altercation with Kuldeep Singh @ Preeti and others during the election of Sarpanch. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioners were arrested on 09.11.2024 and 29.11.2024. They approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail applications filed by the petitioners vide order dated 20.12.2024 and 07.04.2025, respectively. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner Jagtar Singh Ghocha earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing of CRM-M-549-2025 and CRM-M-14530-2025, however, same were dismissed as not



pressed/dismissed on vide orders dated 15.01.2025 and 21.03.2025, respectively. Hence, petitioner Jagtar Singh Ghocha has approached this Court again praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present third petition and petitioner Sarabjeet Singh @ Sarba approached this Court by way of filing the present first petition.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioners on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Sukhpal Singh @ Pala and Sukhpal Singh @ Sukha. He has drawn the attention of this Court, to the orders dated 23.09.2025 and passed in **CRM-M-3887-2025** and **CRM-M-4937-2025**, respectively, whereby co-accused Sukhpal Singh @ Pala and Sukhpal Singh @ Sukha have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. To buttress his arguments, he submits that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents and they are behind the bars since 09.11.2024 and 29.11.2024. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioners deserve to be granted bail as the case of the petitioners is similar to that of the said co-accused, who have already been granted bail.

5. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioners as stated above and has not denied that the petitioners are at par with the co-accused, namely, Sukhpal Singh @ Pala and Sukhpal Singh @ Sukha. He has placed on record the custody certificates of the petitioners.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners were arrested in this case on 09.11.2024 and 29.11.2024. Co-accused, namely, Sukhpal Singh @ Pala



CRM-M-71574-2025

-4-

and Sukhpal Singh @ Sukha are on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with them. Custody certificate of petitioner Jagtar Singh @ Gocha shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 03 months & 25 days as on 09.03.2026. Custody certificate of petitioner Sarabjeet Singh @ Sarba shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 03 months & 06 days as on 09.03.2026 It further reflect that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents.

7. 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. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. 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 Senior counsel for the petitioners succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners on the basis of parity.

8. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

10.03.2026
sharmila

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