

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

224

2026:PHHC:002029



CRM-M-73360-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.01.2026.

TAJINDER SINGH @ TARAN

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Devansh Khanna, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.55 dated 15.04.2024, under Section(s) 302, 341, 324, 506, 148, 149 and 212 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Division No.5, Jalandhar.

Briefly summarized, the instant FIR came to be registered on the statement of the complainant, Vishal alias Mani Jamba who stated that on 14.04.2024 at about 9:15 p.m., his brother, Ankit Jamba, along with his

sister-in-law, Manisha, was proceeding towards Bhargo Camp for the purpose of obtaining medicine. It is stated that when they reached in front of the house of Karan Malhi, the accused persons, namely Daljit alias Sonu, his brother Monu, his father, Tarun, Ajay Kumar alias Baba, Amit Kumar, Karan Malhi, the wife of Karan Malhi and certain unknown persons, were present there and were armed with weapons. Accused Daljit alias Sonu stopped Ankit Jamba and began abusing him. Upon receiving information regarding the incident, the complainant is stated to have immediately reached the spot, where, in his presence, accused Daljit alias Sonu inflicted a *khanjer* blow on the left side of Ankit Jamba's chest. Accused Monu delivered a *datar* blow which struck the back of his neck, while the father of accused Daljit inflicted two *datar* blows on the back of his head. Accused Tarun gave a *kirch* blow on the left side of his back and accused Ajay Kumar alias Baba inflicted a *datar* blow on his left arm and fingers of the left hand. It is further stated that as a result of the assault, Ankit Jamba lost consciousness. Accused Amit Kumar delivered baseball bat blows on his right eye and right cheek. It is further stated that Karan Malhi raised a *lalkara* exhorting the co-accused not to spare the victim and that his wife also instigated the assailants. Thereafter, on people gathering at the spot, the accused persons fled from the scene along with their respective weapons. Thereafter, the complainant took his brother Ankit Jamba to Civil Hospital, Jalandhar wherein he was declared dead. On the basis of the aforesaid statement, the present FIR came to be registered.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has not caused any injury on the person of the deceased. He

contends that the injuries have been attributed to the other co-accused. It is vehemently contended that even though an allegation has been levelled to the effect that the petitioner was armed with a *kirch* and had caused injury on the left hip and back of the deceased, however, the CCTV footage of the incident clearly shows that the petitioner was empty handed and was not wielding any weapon. He contends that no recovery of any weapon has been effected from the petitioner which belies the case of the prosecution in its entirety. It is contended that as many as 25 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution and that no witness has been examined so far. He argues with vehemence that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case other than one jail offence arising out of the same incident. It is contended that there is no evidence on record which would substantiate that the petitioner shared any common object with the other assailants and that he has been nominated as an accused only on account of his presence at the place of occurrence. It is further submitted that as per the custody certificate placed on record, the petitioner has already undergone an actual custody for a period of more than 01 year and 08 months since 26.04.2024 and that the trial has not commenced so far.

State counsel, on the other hand, is not in a position to dispute the facts as aforesaid. He, however, submits that the presence of the petitioner at the place of occurrence is undisputed and that the same would establish that the petitioner was a part of an unlawful assembly which caused multiple injuries on the person of the deceased, who eventually succumbed to the said injuries. He, however, does not dispute that no weapon has been recovered at the instance of the petitioner. He is also not in a position to comment on the CCTV footage as well as the photographs prepared therefrom which are part of the record.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into

consideration the age of the petitioner, who is stated to be 21 years, his clean criminal antecedents, the nature of the allegations attributed to him, the disputed facts with respect to the role of the petitioner, the period of custody of more than 01 year and 08 months and bearing in mind the stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

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.

January 12, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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