



CRM-M-60563-2024

-1-

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

229

CRM-M-60563-2024

Date of decision : 22.07.2025

Gursahib Singh @ Ginni

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Amandeep Singh Rai, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Singh Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.), in case FIR No.40 dated 11.02.2022, under Sections 307/341/323/427/506/148/149 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar Samana, District Patiala.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with other co-accused had given various injuries to the injured-Pradeep Singh. The petitioner is stated to be armed with an iron rod in his hand and is alleged to have given repeated blows on the right side of the head of the injured. He, however, submits that there are material inconsistencies in the prosecution case qua the involvement of the petitioner and the material witnesses, namely, PW-1 Tarminder Singh and PW-8 Baljit Kaur, who are the uncle and wife of the injured-Pradeep Singh respectively, have not supported the prosecution case. He further submits that the petitioner



**CRM-M-60563-2024**

**-2-**

is in custody since 21.02.2022 and is not involved in any other criminal case. He also submits that co-accused, namely, Kamaljit Singh and Sunny Singh have been granted regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-60391-2022 and CRM-M-19954-2023 on 09.01.2023 & 23.12.2023 respectively. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time.

3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner because the petitioner had inflicted injuries which were dangerous to life. He has not corroborated the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to grant of regular bail to co-accused(s). He, upon instructions, submits that 14 out of 31 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

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

5. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel and the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 21.02.2022, he is stated to be not involved in any other criminal case, co-accused(s) have been granted bail, the material prosecution witnesses have not supported the prosecution case qua the involvement of the petitioner and the trial is likely to take a long time as only 14 out of 31 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, therefore, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

**CRM-M-60563-2024****-3-**

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

**(H.S.GREWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**22.07.2025**  
A.Kaundal

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