



108+217

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

**CRM-M-6147-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision : 13.05.2026**

Laddi Singh @ Mastan Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Gurcharan Singh Bains, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ramandeep, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-16896-2026

Prayer in the present application is for preponing the main case to some early actual date as now the compromise has been arrived at between the parties.

In view of the fact that the main case is already listed for today, the present application has been rendered infructuous.

CRM-16897-2026

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Annexure P-3 is taken on record.

Main case

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0063 dated 06.05.2025, under Sections 109, 115(2), 126, 3(5), 351(3) of BNS and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Samana, District Patiala.



2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the present FIR has been lodged on the statement of complainant, Sukhman Singh. It was alleged that he is pursuing a PTE course. On 05.05.2025, at Village Kakrala Bhai Ke, alongwith his friends, namely, Dilpreet Singh Chahal, Vanveet Singh, Dapinder Singh and Karanveer Sharma alias Mirch, he was enjoying at the house of Dilpreet Singh and at about 7.30 p.m. when they were returning to their house, he was driving the motorcycle and Karanveer Sharma was the pillion rider. Upon reaching near Gurudwara Sahib of Kakrala Bhai Ke, a white-coloured Bolero came from behind, on which the word 'Patwari' was written. The said Bolero stopped near them and in order to save themselves, they moved their motorcycle to the side of the road. Gurloveleen Singh @ Geen was driving the said Bolero and after rolling down the window, fired a shot towards him, which hit his left arm, causing him to fall from the motorcycle. Meanwhile, Aakash Sohi, resident of Prem Singh wala, alighted from the conductor seat of Bolero carrying a pistol and fired at him with the intention to kill, which hit his right foot. Meanwhile, Mastan Singh (present petitioner) also came out of the Bolero and raised lalkara that Sukhman and Karanveer Mirch should be killed. The complainant further alleged that thereafter, he and Karanveer left the motorcycle there and ran towards the street of village, while all the three accused fled away from the spot after issuing threats. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. Hence, the FIR was registered, investigation commenced and petitioner was arrested on 18.09.2025. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented and charges were framed. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala, praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing counsel for the parties, the same was declined vide order dated 07.01.2026. Hence, being aggrieved, the petitioner



is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the alleged occurrence has taken place on 05.05.2025. He has submitted that the petitioner along with the co-accused has been alleged to be present however, it is an admitted case of the prosecution that co-accused, namely, Aakash Sohi and Gurloveleen Singh have fired on the complainant, however, the petitioner had alleged to have raised lalkara. He thus, contended that the offence under Section 109 of the BNS have been alleged against the co-accused and not against the petitioner. He submits that even otherwise, the petitioner has compromised the matter with the complainant. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel has contended that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He thus, has submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted the regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has affirmed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the matter has been compromised between the complainant and the petitioner.

5. Status report by way of an affidavit of Mr. Fateh Singh Brar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Samana, District Patiala, filed by learned State counsel, is taken on record.

6. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State, however, has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and he along with the co-accused exhorted the co-accused to fire upon the complainant. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 18 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. He has placed on record the



custody certificate of the petitioner.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that though the name of the petitioner has been mentioned in the FIR, however, the allegations regarding fire upon the complainant are against the co-accused. The petitioner and the complainant has compromised the matter. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 07 months and 23 days as on 12.05.2026. Custody certificate further shows that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. As submitted, out of 18 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.05.2026
m.sharma

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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