



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

221

**CRM-M-53812-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 26.09.2025**

DILJAAN SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. A.S. Kalra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Bareen Pratap Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the head note as well as prayer clause of the petition subsequently added Section 117 (2) of BNS, 2023 could not be mentioned inadvertently, therefore, he be allowed to file amended title and prayer clause by granting some time.

2. Prayer is accepted.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to add Section 117 (2) of BNS, 2023 and supply the amended page of the head note as well as prayer clause in the registry by 30.09.2025 and would be made part of the instant petition.

4. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-



Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
DILJAAN SINGH	79	29.12.2024	115(2), 333, 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 & 117(2) of BNS added later on	Fattu Dhinga	Kapurthala

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that complainant Sukhwinder Singh got registered the instant FIR by alleging that on 28.12.2024, at about 7.30 p.m, petitioner-Diljaan Singh, who was armed with kirpan and co-accused Prabhdeep @ Prabhu was armed with iron dattar, entered their house forcibly and then caused injuries. Petitioner-Diljaan Singh gave a blow of kirpan on the head of Tarsem (uncle of complainant) and on raising alarm '*Mar Dita Mar Ditta*' both the accused fled away from the spot by extending threats of killing the complainant party. The injury attributed to petitioner is found to be grievous and thereupon Section 117(2) of BNS, 2023 has been added. Petitioner is inside jail for the last more than 02 months and offences are triable by a Court of Magistrate. Thus, counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail.

6. On advance notice and in response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 25.09.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

7. As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 02 months and 04 days inside jail.



8. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer of grant of bail to the petitioner and has argued that petitioner has given grievous injuries on vital part of the injured-Tarsem. Therefore, he does not deserve any leniency and thus prays for dismissal of the present petition.

9. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties concerned, and has gone through the instant petition.

10. Considering that all the offences registered against the petitioner are triable by a Court of Magistrate; petitioner is inside jail for a period of 02 months 04 days and the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time. Also considering the fact that, there is an allegation of a single blow caused by the petitioner, with no repetition and the factors notice hereinabove, at this stage, this Court is of the view that petitioner cannot be detained any longer inside jail.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.



13. It is pertinent to note that copy of this order would be uploaded only after supplying of corrected/amended page of head note as well as prayer clause of the petition as directed in the first paragraph of this order.

14. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

26.09.2025

Deepak Patwal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**