



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

220

**CRM-M-47498-2025
Date of decision: 24.09.2025**

JAGPREET SINGH @ JAGGA

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Swarn Tiwana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. Present petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.251 dated 22.12.2023, under Sections 323, 324, 341, 506, 148, 149 of IPC, 1860 (Sections 307, 201, 325 of IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Sadar Khanna, District Ludhiana.

2. Status report dated 19.09.2025 by way of affidavit of Amritpal Singh (PPS), Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Khanna, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana has been filed on behalf of respondent-State and the same is taken on record.

3. Present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Mandeep Singh with the allegations that he is a driver of a school bus owned by Oxford Senior Secondary School, Village Raipur. On 21.12.2023, at about 4:20 pm, he was returning after dropping the school children at their houses and when he reached between village Ikolaha and village Ikolahi near Lakhuana Pond, one Alto car bearing registration No.PB-10-CS-0185 was already parked on



the road. One cart came in front of his bus and he slowed down the vehicle. In the meanwhile, Jagpreet Singh Jagga, Rajveer Singh @ Chakohi, Kamal Khattrra, Laddi Kamma, Baniya Khanna, Bhagwant Singh and one unknown person alighted from the car, who were carrying rods and swords in their hands. They surrounded the bus and Jagpreet Singh @ Jagga gave a rod blow on the wind-screen of the bus. He got panicked and all the accused persons entered the vehicle and in order to save himself, he ran towards the rear seats of the bus. However, Jagpreet Singh @ Jagga came inside the bus and hit him on his head with a rod. Kamal Khattrra and Baniya Khanna hit him with swords and he tried to ward off the blows but the sword blows hit on his hands and arms. Jagpreet Singh @ Jagga continued to hit him on his head and back with rod. Thereafter, Rajveer Singh and Laddi also entered the bus, who were armed with arms and swords and they also caused injuries to him and he fainted. Thereafter, they vandalized the bus and escaped from the spot along with their weapons. His brother took him to the hospital with the help of people who had gathered at the spot and he sought action against the assailants.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Learned counsel next contended that no offence under Section 307 of IPC is made out, as injuries No.3 and 6 have been declared to be grievous in nature, while remaining injuries are simple in nature but no opinion has been given by the doctor that any of the injuries suffered by the victim is dangerous to life. Learned counsel further contended that the petitioner



CRM-M-47498-2025

- 3-

is in custody since 13.07.2024 and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented on 08.03.2024. Out of 13 witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 02 witnesses have been examined till date, and thus trial will take long time to conclude and no useful purpose will be served by detaining the petitioner in custody and therefore, petitioner may be released on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State Counsel has opposed the bail and argued that in view of the gravity of the offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. As per opinion of the doctor, two of the injuries were grievous in nature and remaining injuries are simple. None of the injuries suffered by the victim has been declared dangerous to life. As such, it will be a debatable question during trial, as to whether offence under Section 307 of IPC is made out or not. Petitioner is in custody since 13.07.2024 and only 02 witnesses have been examined till date, out of 13 witnesses cited by the prosecution. Therefore, trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude and no useful purpose will thus be served by detaining the petitioner in custody.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything upon the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

24.09.2025
amandeep

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