

2026:PHHC:001218



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

213

CRM-M-72722-2025
Date of Decision: 09.01.2026

HUSANPREET SINGH @ HUSAN

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Gaurav and Mr. Parshant, Advocates
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. (483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.180 dated 13.11.2023 under Sections 323, 324, 506, 307, 148 and 149 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Division-A, Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused had given severe and lethal injuries to the complainant party. The present petitioner was armed with a baseball bat, which he allegedly hit on the right side of head of Harnek Singh, the cousin of the complainant and his co-accused namely Billa had fired gunshot towards Harnek Singh, however, the same hit the right thigh of the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the present case, only the simple injury has been attributed to the present petitioner. He further

submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 08 months and 28 days. The trial of the case is yet to commence and as such, the same might take long time to conclude. Hence, the counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that there is an active role of the petitioner in the commission of the offence in question. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner has already undergone a period of 08 months and 28 days.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 08 months and 28 days and the trial against the petitioner might take long time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.
10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

JANUARY 09, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No