



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-52033-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 19.09.2025

Chhinda Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Kuldeep Singh Siwach, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. S.S. Dhillon, Advocate for

Mr. Vikas Bishnoi, Advocate for the complainant

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of The Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in FIR bearing No.39 dated 16.03.2025, registered under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 61(2), 109(1), 117(2), 238, 61 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 25 (Act No.54) of the Arms Act, 1959 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.

3. 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, Gursevak, Deepu, Avtar Singh @ Kala, Arshdeep, Tarandeep @ Tarva 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.

4. It was further alleged that two persons fired shots with intent to kill. 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 complainant's back, 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.

5. Memorandum of appearance on behalf of the complainant has been filed today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the injuries attracting the offence under Section 109 (1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 stands attributed to the co-accused and on account of the gun-fire shots that were sustained by Harjinder and Gurdeep Singh. He contends that the petitioner has at best been attributed a danda blow to the complainant-Suren Singh, which such injury is simple in nature. He contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 16.03.2025. The investigation stands completed and that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

7. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

8. Counsel for the complainant, however, vehemently contends that the petitioner alongwith other armed group of persons opened an attack on the complainant party thereby not only injuring the complainant but also fired gun-shots which resulted in injuries on the hands and stomach of Harjinder Singh and legs of Gurpreet Singh.

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

10. It is evident that the petitioner has been attributed a simple injury on the injured witness-complainant and not attributed to the injury entailing the offence under Section 109(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,



2023. Besides, the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal offence, and only the charges have been framed before the trial court. Bearing in mind the actual custody of more than 05 months undergone by the petitioner and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

11. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

12. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

13. 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.

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**19.09.2025**

*Mangal Singh*

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