



251

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

CRM-M-39879-2025

Date of Decision:31.07.2025

DANIEL ALIAS DAINI

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

**Coram :** Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**Present :** Mr. J.S. Thakur, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)**

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.62 dated 01.04.2024, registered under Sections 324, 326, 307, 506, 120-B, 148, 149 of IPC 1860 and Section 25 Arms Act 1959 added later on, Police Station Sadar, Jalandhar Commissionerate.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Sukhwinder Singh son of late Davinder Singh and the same has been reproduced below:-

*“Statement Sukhwinder Singh son of Late Davinder Singh, resident of Sansarpur, PS Jalandhar aged about 59 years, Mobile No.98150-43553. Stated that I am resident of aforesaid address and I am doing agriculture work and sale and purchase of*



*property. I have two children one son and one daughter. The name of my son is Rajdeep Singh alias Lally whose age is about 30 years and who is doing agriculture work with me. On 30.03.2024, my son went on motorcycle No.PB-08- DCH 0557 Marka Hero Splendor at about 05:00 PM by saying that he is going to market purchase some articles. After this about 9.20 PM, I received phone call from Johal Hospital, Jalandhar that your son has been got admitted to Johal Hospital, Jalandhar by some passerby on account of injuries suffered by him on road going from Khusropur to Mehak Restaurant. Then I immediately went to Johal Hospital alongwith my wife Gurjeet Kaur and saw that injuries were inflicted to my son Rajdeep Singh alias Lally with an intentional to kill him by making an assault upon him. My son is addicted to intoxicants. A few days back Anthony alias Kandi and his wife Gamma have extended threats to him that you are not making payment after taking the intoxicants and that we will eliminate you. A few days back Anthony alias Kandi, Manish alias Money, Vishal Gill alias Aalu, Chandan alias Chandu S/o Madan Singh, Denial alias Denny picked up a quarrel with my son. I have come to know that all these persons alongwith some unknown persons had hatched a conspiracy and made assault upon my son with deadly weapons with an intention to kill him and believing him to be dead ran away after throwing him on the road. With God's grace the life of my son has been saved who is under treatment at Johal Hospital Jalandhar. Legal action be taken against Anthony alias Kandi, Manish alias Money, Vishal Gill alias Aalu, Chandán alias Chandu S/o Madan Singh, Denial alias Denny on account of grave injuries inflicted to my son as under shock and could not get my statement recorded. I have got recorded my statement and have heard it which s correct. Sd/- Sukhwinder Singh, Phone No.98150-43553. Sd/- Gurjit Kaur. Sd/- Manjit Singh.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that admittedly Sukhwinder Singh is not an eye witness and he has lodged the FIR by levelling



false allegations in the present case. Further, even the petitioner was not named in the FIR and it has been alleged that the petitioner and other accused had caused injuries on account of some previous enmity between the parties. It has been alleged that the injured in the present case had suffered four injuries, however, he has already been discharged from the hospital and is hale and hearty. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 01.04.2024 and is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 03 months. Learned counsel further submits that only 03 witnesses out of total 16 witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is not likely to conclude in near future.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court. However, he admits that there is no other case against the petitioner.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

6. In the present case, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last more than 01 year and 03 months. Moreover, only 03 witnesses out of total 16 witnesses have been examined so far. Thus, the trial Court may take considerable time to conclude the trial. Moreover, the petitioner is a first offender. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his



furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

**31.07.2025**  
*vipin*

**(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)**  
**JUDGE**

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