



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

221-1

**CRM-M-56711-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.08.2025**

YADWINDER SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate with
Ms. Bhavi Kapur, Advocate and
Mr. Jasraj Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), seeking regular bail in FIR No.40 dated 14.03.2022 under Sections 302, 307, 148, 149 IPC, 1860 and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act (Sections 212, 216, 120-B IPC, 1860 added subsequently during investigation) registered at Police Station Nakodar Sadar, District Jalandhar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 04 assailants have alighted from their vehicle and fired shots at one Sandeep Singh who was a famous *kabaddi* player. The petitioner namely Yadwinder Singh is stated to be involved in the present case as a conspirator to the said murder. The petitioner is stated to have not been named in the FIR, however, he was named in the supplementary statement of the complainant to the effect that he came to know that the petitioner alongwith his other co-accused are also involved in the conspiracy of the murder of his brother-Sandeep Singh (since deceased).



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has neither been named in the FIR nor any specific role has been attributed to him. He further states that the petitioner has undergone a custody period of more than 03 years and 04 months and trial in the present case is yet to commence.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Deepender Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State states that .32 bore pistol along with 04 live rounds has been recovered and also the vehicle which was used by the assailants to escape from the spot has also been recovered on the basis of disclosure statement of the petitioner. By way of filing of custody certificate, he vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner has undergone a custody period of 03 years, 04 months and 12 days and trial is yet to commence.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. The country made pistol so recovered, is not stated to be connected with the alleged crime. Also, there is no direct evidence to link the vehicle so recovered with the alleged crime. Apart from the disclosure statement of one Jujhaar Singh as well as the supplementary statement of the complainant which is also hear-say, there is no direct evidence on record at this stage which can implicate the petitioner in the said occurrence. Keeping in view the above and the fact that the custody undergone by the petitioner is 03 years, 04 months and 12 days; the trial is yet to commence and since, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of



regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

19th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No