



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

218

CRM-M-13088-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 13.05.2026

Manpreet Singh @ Mani

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Mohit Kumar, Advocate;
Mr. Mohsin Ali Shah, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.162 dated 03.11.2025, registered under Section(s) 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 118(2), 351(2)(3), 191(3) and 190, 238 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Sadar Ahmedgarh, District Malerkotla.

2. Briefly summarised, the facts of present case are that:-

“xxxxx the present case was registered on the basis of statement of complainant Jatinder Singh, in which, it has been alleged that he joined Indian Army in the year 2018 and he is doing duty at 18 Training Unit, Arunachal Pradesh at present. It has been further alleged that his elder brother Amrinder Singh is residing in England. It has been further alleged that



he came to his house on dated 13.10.2025 for one month after taking leave. It has been further alleged that he and his nephew Arshpreet Singh went to the shop of Pritpal Singh, Chowkidar for purchasing household articles on dated 01.11.2025. It has been further alleged that his nephew was in the shop and the complainant was standing in the street in front of the house of the aforesaid Pritpal Singh. It has been further alleged that in the meantime, the co accused Karanveer Singh armed with kirpan (sword), the co-accused Darshan Singh armed with kirpan(sword), the petitioner Manpreet Singh @Manni armed with sariya (iron bar), the co-accused Sukhwinder Singh armed with kirpan(sword) and the co-accused Jashnpreet Singh armed with dah (sharp-edged iron weapon used for cutting) came there and encircled the complainant. It has been further alleged that the co-accused Darshan Singh raised a lalkara that the complainant would be killed on that day. It has been further alleged that the co-accused Karanveer Singh inflicted kirpan(sword) blow on the left side of the head of the complainant with the intention to kill him. It has been further alleged that the co-accused Darshan Singh had inflicted kirpan(sword) blow on the left side of the head of the complainant. It has been further alleged that the co-accused Jashanpreet Singh had inflicted iron dah blow on the left shoulder of the complainant. It has been further alleged that the petitioner Manpreet Singh had



inflicted sariya (iron bar) blow on the right ear of the complainant. It has been further alleged that the petitioner Manpreet Singh inflicted sariya (iron bar) blow on the right elbow of the complainant. It has been further alleged that the complainant raised hue and cry, on which, his nephew Arshpreet Singh came out of the shop. It has been further alleged that the co-accused Karanveer Singh inflicted kirpan (sword) blow on the left side of the head of Arshpreet Singh. It has been further alleged that the co-accused Sukhwinder Singh inflicted kirpan (sword) blow on the left shoulder of Arshpreet Singh with the intention to kill him. It has been further alleged that the co-accused Jashanpreet Singh inflicted iron dah blow on the left side of chest of Arshpreet Singh. It has been further alleged that the co-accused Jashanpreet Singh inflicted reverse side of iron dah blow on the back of Arshpreet Singh. It has been further alleged that the petitioner Manpreet Singh inflicted sariya (iron bar) blow on the right leg of Arshpreet Singh. It has been further alleged that the petitioner Manpreet Singh inflicted sariya blow on the left arm of Arshpreet Singh. It has been further alleged that on hearing their hue and cry, Pritpal Singh chowkiar and his nephew (Bhanja) Amandeep Singh came at the spot and they saved the complainant and Arshpreet Singh. It has been further alleged that the people gathered at the spot and all the accused ran away from the spot with their respective weapons. It has been further alleged

that Amandeep Singh and the panch Ashraf Mohd. got them admitted in the Civil Hospital, Malerkotla, from where, they were referred to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala. The above said facts converted into FIR without ascertaining the truthfulness.”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been attributed injuries with iron rod on the right elbow of the complainant and right leg and left arm of Arshpreet Singh, which are simple in nature. It is contended that the investigation in the present case is complete and all the offences are triable by the Court of a Magistrate. He submits that there are total 16 prosecution witnesses which are to be examined in the present case. He submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and was arrested on 27.12.2025 and has been in custody since then.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. It is however submitted that there are specific attributions against the petitioner in the present case.

5. At this stage, Mr. Gaurav Vir S. Behl, Advocate enters appearance and files vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant in the Court today and the same is taken on record. He vehemently opposes the prayer made by the counsel for the petitioner and submits that there are specific attributions against the petitioner and recovery of iron rod has also been effected from him. The petitioner has inflicted as many as 03 injuries on the person of the complainant and injured/Arshdeep Singh. He, however, does not dispute the lack of criminal antecedents of the petitioner, the fact that the



injuries attributed to the petitioner are simple in nature and investigation in the present case is complete.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, his clean antecedents, nature of injuries alleged to have been caused by him, the stage of the trial and bearing in mind that all the offences are triable by a Magistrate and thus the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa 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 observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

13.05.2026

Mangal Singh

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