



260+261

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

CRM-M-39533-2025

Date of Decision:20.08.2025

Gurvinder Singh @ Sahib

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

(ii)

CRM-M-40543-2025

Davinder Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Munish Puri, Advocate with
Mr. Harsh Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose off two bail petitions i.e CRM-M-39533-2025 titled as "***Gurvinder Singh @ Sahib Vs. State of Punjab***" and CRM-M-40543-2025 titled as "***Davinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab***", whereby the petitioners have prayed for grant of regular bail to them in case arising out of FIR No.26, dated 07.03.2025, registered under Sections 109,118(1),126(2),3(5) of B.N.S and Section 238 of B.N.S added later on, Police Station Division No.2, District Pathankot.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that as per the case set up by the prosecution, Gurvinder Singh @ Sahib (petitioner in CRM-M-39533-



2025) was carrying a fire arm and threatened the complainant. He was also allegedly armed with a *dattar* and caused injuries on the left wrist, left arm, left palm and left hand fingers of the complainant. Out of those injuries caused by the injured, two injuries have been declared to be grievous in nature. He next contends that as per the case of the prosecution Davinder Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-40543-2025) was armed with a sword and gave a blow on the head of the complainant. He further contends that Arjun, injured has already been discharged from the hospital. The petitioners were arrested in the present case on 07.03.2025 and are in custody for the last more than five months. He further contends that no witness has been examined so far out of total 18 witnesses and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) on the ground that three more FIRs were registered against Gurvinder Singh @ Sahib (petitioner in CRM-M-39533-2025) and the present petition(s) deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

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

5. No doubt, three more FIRs were ordered to be registered against Gurvinder Singh @ Sahib (petitioner in CRM-M-39533-2025), but the same cannot be denied the concession of bail in the present case only on the ground that the petitioner has been able to make out a case for grant of bail in the facts and circumstances of the present case. Reliance can also be placed in the matter of *Prabhakar Tewari Vs. State of U.P., and another 2020(1) R.C.R.*



(Criminal) 831 in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the pendency of several criminal cases against the accused cannot be the basis to refuse the prayer of bail. Similar observations have been made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P., and another 2012(1) R.C.R. (Criminal) 586.*** The petitioners are stated to be in custody custody for the last about five months and no witness has been examined so far and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition(s) are allowed. The petitioner(s) are ordered to be released on bail pending trial on their furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate

20.08.2025

hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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