



CRM-M-73401-2025

1

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

Sr. No.116

CRM-M-73401-2025
Date of Decision: 05.03.2026

KARAMVEER SINGH ALIAS LOVELY**...Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present:- Mr. B.S. Kundra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 147 dated 16.06.2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 118(1) and 109 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, with Section 118(2) of BNS and Sections 27/61/85 of the NDPS Act added later on, at Police Station Mandi Gobindgarh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2. As per the prosecution case, on 16.06.2025 at about 1:30 PM, the complainant Yatin Walia was standing outside his house in Master Colony, Mandi Gobindgarh. At that time, the accused Karamveer Singh alias Lovely came there and rebuked him. When the complainant objected, the accused allegedly inflicted a sword blow towards the head of the complainant with an intention to kill him. In order to save himself, the complainant raised his right hand and the blow struck his right hand.

Thereafter, the accused allegedly gave another blow with the sword which



hit the left hand of the complainant. On hearing the alarm raised by the complainant, a crowd gathered at the spot and the accused fled away along with the weapon of offence. During investigation, as per report dated 17.06.2025, the accused was found to have consumed morphine and cocaine. After completion of investigation, challan was presented before the learned Illaqa Magistrate on 12.09.2025 and the case was committed to the Court of Sessions. Charges were framed on 06.11.2025 under Sections 109 and 118(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 27 of the NDPS Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he was not present at the alleged spot of occurrence. It is submitted that the complainant has concocted a false story only to implicate the petitioner with an ulterior motive. Learned counsel further submits that the present FIR is a counterblast to the earlier action taken against the complainant, as the petitioner had allegedly exposed the complainant while purchasing drugs and had also recorded the incident, which resulted in registration of a case against the complainant under the NDPS Act. It is argued that due to the said incident, the complainant bore a grudge against the petitioner and threatened to implicate him in a false case.

4. It has also been contended that immediately after coming to know about the registration of the present FIR, the petitioner himself went to the police station and surrendered before the police officials. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner was kept in the police station for one night before being produced before the Illaqa Magistrate and



thereafter a report was prepared showing the petitioner to be positive in the dope test, which according to the petitioner is doubtful and manipulated. It is further submitted that the petitioner had never consumed any drugs and the possibility of the petitioner being given food containing drug substance while he was in police custody cannot be ruled out.

5. It is further contended that the petitioner is in custody since June 2025 and the trial is likely to take considerable time as there are several prosecution witnesses yet to be examined. Learned counsel has also argued that during the course of trial, certain witnesses have not supported the prosecution case on material aspects relating to the alleged occurrence and the place of occurrence, which according to the petitioner creates serious doubt regarding the prosecution version. On these grounds, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that on the day of occurrence, the petitioner, with an intention to kill the complainant Yatin Walia, inflicted sword blows upon him. It is argued that the petitioner first attempted to give a sword blow towards the head of the complainant, however, the complainant raised his right hand to save himself and the blow struck his right hand. Thereafter, another blow of the sword was inflicted which hit the left hand of the complainant. It is further submitted that one of the injuries suffered by the complainant has been declared grievous in nature, thereby attracting the offence punishable under Section 326 IPC. In view of the serious nature of allegations and the manner in which the injuries were inflicted with a sharp-



edged weapon, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their assistance. The allegations against the petitioner are of a serious nature. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner inflicted multiple sword blows upon the complainant with an intention to kill him. The material on record shows that the petitioner first attempted to inflict a blow towards the head of the complainant and when the complainant raised his hand to save himself, the blow struck his hand. Thereafter, another blow was inflicted causing further injury to the complainant. It has also come on record that one of the injuries sustained by the complainant has been declared grievous in nature. Thus, the allegations disclose commission of a serious offence involving use of a sharp-edged weapon and an attempt to cause fatal injuries to the complainant.

8. It is also relevant to note that the complainant, who has appeared as PW1 before the trial Court, has categorically deposed on oath regarding the manner in which the occurrence took place and has specifically identified himself as well as the accused in the CCTV footage placed on record. At this stage, such testimony cannot be ignored merely because some other witnesses have partly turned hostile on certain aspects which are not material to the core of the prosecution case. The fact that some witnesses have not fully supported the prosecution version on certain aspects does not by itself entitle the petitioner to the concession of bail, particularly when the main witness to the occurrence has already been examined and has supported the prosecution case regarding the manner in which the assault



was committed. Considering the gravity of allegations, the nature of injuries inflicted with a sharp-edged weapon and the circumstances in which the occurrence is stated to have taken place, this Court does not find any sufficient ground to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. Moreover, the petitioner is in custody for about eight months only and the trial is already in progress.

9. In view of the aforesaid discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

10. However, anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

05.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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