



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

224

**CRM-M-14836-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 19.05.2025**

SATNAM SINGH

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present : Mr. G.B.S. Dhillon, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Durgesh Garg, AAG Punjab.

Mr. J.S. Jaidka, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 439 CrPC for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the following case :-

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
93	14.10.2023	302, 323, 341, 506, 34 IPC; (302 IPC deleted and 304 IPC added later on)	Daba, Ludhiana, District Ludhiana, Punjab

2. It is, *inter alia*, contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that no injury has been attributed to the petitioner and the only



injury on the forehead of the deceased has been attributed to co-accused Sukhchain Singh. He further contends that the allegation against the petitioner in the FIR is simply of having given fist blows to the deceased. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 14.10.2023 and he is not having any criminal antecedents. After the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time. Thus, prays for grant of concession of bail to the petitioner.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel while referring to the status report filed by the State has opposed the petition on the ground that considering the heinous nature of the crime, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail and prays for dismissal of the petition.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. The version of prosecution in brief is that on 14.10.2023, there was a quarrel between two factions, wherein Dargahi Parsad and his son Pardeep Kumar sustained injuries, while the opposite faction was comprising of Sandeep Kaur, Sukhchain Singh and Satnam Singh. On the police reaching the hospital, it was found that Dargahi Parsad succumbed to the injuries and his son Pardeep Kumar got recorded his statement to the effect that he was working in the vacant plot adjoining his shop and his father Dargahi Parsad was sitting in the shop. Co-accused Sandeep Kaur came to the spot and started abusing the complainant. Co-accused Sukhchain Singh and petitioner also came there and started beating the complainant. When his father Dargahi Parsad came to the spot, the assailants started



beating him also. Co-accused Sukhchain Singh gave an iron rod blow on the forehead of the father of the complainant and Sandeep Kaur pushed him, due to which he fell down on the ground and the petitioner gave fist blows on his chest while Sandeep Kaur gave leg blows. The injured was shifted to the hospital, where Dargahi Parsad succumbed to the injuries.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that although the petitioner is named in the FIR, but only the allegation of having given fist blows has been levelled against the petitioner. The fatal injury sustained by the deceased on his forehead is attributed to co-accused Sukhchain Singh, which happens to be the only injury recorded in the post-mortem report. Admittedly, the petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents and is in custody since 14.10.2023 and after the completion of investigation, challan has been presented in Court. The conclusion of trial to ascertain the criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner, will take sufficient long time as only 01 witness has been examined out of 16 witnesses cited by the prosecution. In the circumstances, no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any longer.

7. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Judge on Duty/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.



8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

19.05.2025

S.Sharma(syr)

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No