



213 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-53861-2025
Decided on : 26.09.2025

Ishardass @ Isherdass Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present : Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Vinod S. Bhardwaj, J.(Oral)

Instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking concession of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.39 dated 16.03.2025 under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 115(2), 61(2), 109(1), 117(2), 238 and 61 of BNS and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Sadar Ratia District Fatehabad.

2. Briefly summarised, the facts of the present case are that the FIR was registered on the basis of the statement of complainant Suren Singh, son of Harnam Singh, son of Khan Singh, resident of Lohgarh, District Mansa (Punjab), recorded in the presence of Sukhraj Singh, Sarpanch, and Jaspal. The complainant stated that he has two brothers, namely, Jagir Singh (the youngest) and Sucha Singh, while he himself is the eldest. It was alleged that in village Birabadi, 11 acres of gair marusi land stands in the name of their father late Shri Harnam Singh, which had been purchased by one Jeewan, resident of Pilanchhian, from the owner Mohan Lal. In respect of the said land,



Jeewan had already got registered FIR No. 25 of 2025 at Police Station Sadar Ratia against the complainant.

3. The complainant further alleged that on 16.03.2025, while he and his family were working in their fields, several persons, namely, Lakhbir, Malkit, Angrej Singh, Gurdas, Jaspal, Mandeep, Sandeep, Gurmeet, Harjinder, Gurdeep Singh, residents of Lohgarh, along with his niece Manpreet Kaur and son-in-law Hamraj Singh, had come to meet them. At about 01:00–01:30 p.m., 3–4 cars and motorcycles reached the spot, from which Semo @ Sambhu, Gori @ Sahajpreet, Gursevak, Deepu, Avtar Singh @ Kala, Arshdeep, Tarandeep @ Tarva and about 25 unknown persons got off. They were allegedly armed with pistols, knives, kappas and other sharp-edged weapons, and threatened the complainant party to vacate the land, declaring that they had been sent by Jeewan.

4. It was further alleged that two persons fired shots with intent to kill. Harjinder Singh sustained bullet injuries on his left hand and stomach, while Gurpreet Singh suffered a bullet injury on his left thigh. Thereafter, the assailants attacked the complainant party with sharp-edged weapons. Semo @ Sambhu allegedly inflicted injuries on the complainant's back, while Gori @ Rovit caused injuries to Jaspal. The remaining assailants, along with 25 unknown persons, also inflicted injuries on them. The complainant alleged that the entire attack was orchestrated at the instance of Jeewan, who had sent the assailants to forcibly dispossess them of their land. He prayed that strict legal action be taken against the accused persons.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the injuries attracting the offence under Section 109(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,



2023 stands attributed to the co-accused. He contends that the case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused Chhinda Singh, who has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 19.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-52033-2025.

6. The aforesaid facts were not disputed by learned counsel for the State.

7. Taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner has been attributed a simple injury and not attributed an injury entailing the offence under Section 109(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and also the fact that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused Chhinda Singh, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 19.09.2025, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. The petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to him furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

26.09.2025
sonia

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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