

2025:PHHC:137659



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

215

**CRM-M-54255-2025
Date of decision: 30.09.2025**

JAGSIR SINGHPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANARespondents

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

Present: - Mr. Munish Kamboj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Chhavi Sharma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition is for seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 0039 dated 16.03.2025 registered under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 109(1) and 61 (Sections 117(2), 238 of BNS were added later on) and Section 25 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station Sadar Ratia, District Fatehabad.

2. Briefly summarised, the facts of the present case are that the FIR was registered on the basis of the statement of complainant Suren Singh, son of Harnam Singh, son of Khan Singh, resident of Lohgarh, District Mansa (Punjab), recorded in the presence of Sukhraj Singh, Sarpanch, and Jaspal. The complainant stated that he has two brothers, namely, Jagir Singh (the youngest) and Sucha Singh, while he (himself) is the eldest. It was

alleged that in village Birabadi, 11 acres of gair marusi land stands in the name of their father late Shri Harnam Singh, which had been purchased by one Jeewan, resident of Pilanchhian, from the owner Mohan Lal. In respect of the said land, Jeewan had already got registered FIR No. 25 of 2025 at Police Station Sadar Ratia against the complainant. The complainant further alleged that on 16.03.2025, while he and his family were working in their fields, several persons, namely, Lakhbir, Malkit, Angrej Singh, Gurdas, Jaspal, Mandeep, Sandeep, Gurmeet, Harjinder, Gurdeep Singh, residents of Lohgarh, along with his niece Manpreet Kaur and son-in-law Hamraj Singh, had come to meet them. At about 01:00–01:30 p.m., 3–4 cars and motorcycles reached the spot, from which Semo @ Sambhu, Gori @ Sahajpreet, Gursewak, Deepu, Avtar Singh @ Kala, Arshdeep, Tarandeep @ Tarvi and about 25 unknown persons got off. They were allegedly armed with pistols, knives, kappas and other sharp-edged weapons, and threatened the complainant party to vacate the land, declaring that they had been sent by Jeewan. It was further alleged that two persons fired shots with intent to kill them. Harjinder Singh sustained bullet injuries on his left hand and stomach, while Gurpreet Singh suffered a bullet injury on his left thigh. Thereafter, the assailants attacked the complainant party with sharp-edged weapons. Semo @ Sambhu allegedly inflicted injuries on the back of the complainant, while Gori @ Rovit caused injuries to Jaspal. The remaining assailants, along with 25 unknown persons, also inflicted injuries on them. The complainant alleged that the entire attack was orchestrated at the instance of Jeewan, who had sent the assailants to forcibly dispossess them of their land. He prayed that strict legal action be taken against the accused persons.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR. Despite the fact that no link was established between the present petitioner and the alleged crime, he has been falsely implicated by the investigation agency. He further submits that similarly placed co-accused namely Chhinda Singh and Ishardass have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 19.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-52033-2025 and order dated 26.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-53861 of 2025.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid fact, however, he submits that while the petitioner was attributed blow with an iron pipe, the other co-accused was attributed blow with a danda. However, he submits that the same would not make any material difference in the allegations and the nature of offence.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the above and extending parity with co-accused namely Chhinda Singh and Ishardass having already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 19.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-52033-2025 and order dated 26.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-53861 of 2025, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. 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.

9. 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.

SEPTEMBER 30, 2025

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No