



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

135

CRM-M-72642-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 11.03.2026

Resham Singh @ Bau

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Amar Jeet, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.136 dated 24.10.2024, registered under Section(s) 109, 3(5), 132, 324(4), 221 (Section 111(2) added later on) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sultanwind, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the complaint/statement of Jasdeep Singh @ Sajan son of Santokh Singh. The same reads thus:-

“Statement of Jasdeep Singh, alias Sajan, son of Santokh Singh, resident of House No. 83, Street No. 9 B, Sundar Nagar, Amritsar, age 36 years, mobile number 7826806516, noted that he is a resident of the above said address and working in sodha

factory with my father. Yesterday, on 18-10-2024, at 11:00 am slept after taking dinner, at about 2 AM the sound of a gunshot was heard outside the street, we looked at the roof of our house, we did not see anyone, and at 9:30 am, when morning we woke up, there were holes in the main gate of my house. When I checked in the street, I found about 6 shells near my gate, some unknown persons have shot at my gate, but I have no enmity with anyone and neither do I have suspicion on anyone at this time. These unknown persons have shot at the gate of my house to intimidate me. I along with Amandeep Singh were coming to inform you that you have been found.”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that initially the FIR was registered against unknown persons and that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner in the present case. He contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 24.10.2024 and has undergone an actual custody of more than 01 year 04 months. He submits that only 03 out of the total 32 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time in its conclusion.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. He, however, contends that the allegations levelled in the present case are serious in nature and that the petitioner alongwith co-accused/Gurinder Singh @ Guri fired shots at the police party when a search operation was being carried out to arrest them.

5. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the young age of the petitioner i.e. 23 years, the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, the stage of the trial wherein only 03 out of the total 32 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and bearing in mind that trial is likely to take a long time to conclude, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

11.03.2026

Mangal Singh

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