



247

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

CRM-M-73717-2025

Date of decision : 13.01.2026

Manjit Pal Singh**....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Nandan Jindal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rituraj Singh, D.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.238, dated 23.11.2023, under Sections 302, 307, 332, 333, 353, 186, 148, 149, 120-B of IPC and Sections 25, 27, 54, 59 of Arms Act (lateron Sections 201 and 115 of IPC, were added), registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, SI Lakhwinder Singh. It was alleged that on 20.11.2023, Baba Maan Singh Budha Dal, resident of Ward No.10, Gurudwara Guhla, District Kaithal and his accomplice Nihang Singh, in connivance with each other, had taken the illegal possession over Gurudwara Akal Bugga Sahib Lodhi located opposite Gurudwara Shri Ber Singh Sahib, Sultanpur, regarding which FIR No.235, dated 21.11.2023, under Sections 307, 323, 324, 342, 447, 448, 511, 436, 427, 148, 149, 379-B IPC and Sections 25/27-54-59 of



Arms Act, at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi was registered. It was alleged that during the investigation, 13 accused persons were arrested. Then on 22.11.2023, Baba Maan Singh Budha Dal along with his accomplices had tried to encroach upon Gurudwara of Peer Gaib Gaji Jagga, against whom prohibition proceedings under Sections 107, 150 Cr.P.C. were initiated. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi was appointed as Administrator and thus, for maintaining the law and order, the police was deputed to prevent any untoward incident. When the police party was on patrolling and reached near the deputed police officials, then all of sudden, inside Gurudwara Sahib, Baba Maan Singh, Baba Sahib Pal Singh, Baldev Singh, Gurinder Singh, Avtar Singh and 35-40 other unknown persons, who were armed with wielding *datar, swords, spears (barchhas), javelins* and other deadly weapons, started firing upon the police party. Gurinder Singh son of Jagtar Singh along with others opened attack on the police party. During this firing, PHG Jaspal Singh received bullet injury and he succumbed to the injury. 14 other police officials received injuries. Thus the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of Manjit Pal Singh @ Manjitpal (present petitioner) surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case and resultantly, he was arrested on 24.11.2023. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Kapurthala praying for the grant of bail. However after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Kapurthala declined the same vide order dated 12.04.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this



bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Gurinder Singh. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the common order dated 10.12.2025 passed by this Court in **CRM-M-24331-2025 and CRM-M-62309-2025**, whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Iqbal Singh and Gurinder Singh, have been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that the petitioner had been arrayed as an accused on 24.11.2023 on the basis of statement of ASI Ashok Kumar recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. It is submitted that it was alleged that the petitioner was armed with a *gandasa* and he inflicted the blow of the same on his head. He has invited the attention of this Court to the MLR of ASI Ashok Kumar and has submitted that the injuries as mentioned in the MLR do not corroborate the ocular version. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he is behind bars from last more than 02 years. He thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner had played an active role whose complicity was surfaced during the investigation. He submits that the petitioner had caused injuries to ASI Ashok Kumar with the *gandasa*. However, he endorsed the fact that co-accused, namely, Gurinder Singh, has been granted bail by this Court. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was allegedly a part of the unlawful assembly. The MLR of ASI Ashok Kumar mentioned regarding the



injuries which shows that he had suffered 03 injuries out of which injury No.1 was a red bruise on the right leg whereas injuries No.2 and 3 were regarding the pain and swelling. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 02 years, 01 month and 15 days as on 12.01.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner have already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 10.12.2025.

6. 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.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

13.01.2026
ps-I

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