



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

117

**CRM-M-58368-2025
Decided on : 23.04.2026**

Shubhdeep Singh @ Shubh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Shubhdeep Singh @ Shubh	109	30.06.2019	S. 307, 324, 341, 506, 34 of IPC and S. 25 of Arms Act, 1959 [offence u/s 323, 326, 120-B of IPC, added later on]	Gharinda	Amritsar Rural

2. In the bail application, filed by the petitioner before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, arguments addressed by learned Public Prosecutor before the trial Court, is reproduced here-under:-

“4. Instant application has been hotly contested by Id. Additional Public Prosecutor for the State with the submission that there are serious allegations against applicant and his co-accused. On 30.06.2019, when complainant was returning from his fields, four persons in a Swift Car approached him and asked him about route for Chheharta.



When complainant was explaining them the route, two persons alighted from the rear seats of the Car. One of them was having datar and the other one was having pistol. When those persons started using foul language, complainant leaving his motorcycle rushed in the fields. The complainant had a narrow escape from the gunshot fired by the armed person. Three of them started chasing him. One of them who was unarmed caught hold the complainant and the person armed with datar gave blow of his datar towards head of complainant, which rested on right arm, raised to safeguard head. The person armed with sword gave blow, which rested on left hand. Another blow was given with the datar on the right leg. Another two blows of sword were also given, which rested on left knee and left eye. Two blows of datar were given, which rested on right thigh and left arm. On raising hue and cry, all those persons fled from the spot. During investigation, all those persons were apprehended and the person, who was armed with sword and had given three blows with sharp side of sword, was the present applicant. Considering all these serious allegations of attempt to murder, causing grievous hurt etc., even earlier bail application of the applicant was dismissed. The applicant is involved in 16 other FIRs registered with similar serious allegations. Thus, in case the applicant is released on bail, he is not only likely to abscond but also likely to threaten/influence the prosecution witnesses and commit similar serious offences. Thus, Id. Additional Public Prosecutor for the State concluded his arguments with the prayed for dismissal of the bail application.”

Thereon, following was observed by the trial Court, while dismissing the aforesaid bail application of the petitioner, vide order dated 24.09.2025 (P-2):-

“6. Perusal of the record reveals that in the case in hand, the FIR was registered on the basis of statement of complainant/injured Prabhjeet Singh against unknown accused. As it is apparent from the medico legal report, he was having 13 injuries on his person and a number of those injuries were found grievous and were inflicted with sharp edged weapons. The factum of registration of FIR against unknown person, rules out the scope for false implication. It is further apparent from the police report that on the apprehension of accused, they were duly identified. Thus, apparently, the allegations against the applicant are of quite serious nature and same at this stage cannot be said to be without any basis. The



factum of involvement of the applicant in a number of other criminal cases registered with serious allegations, can also not be ignored. Though the applicant is in custody since long but in the given circumstances, his release on bail, is most likely to result in posing a threat to the complainant whose statement is yet to be completed and other private witnesses, who are yet to be examined and it can also not be ruled out that applicant would not abscond or would not commit any such serious offence, in case he is released on bail.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner is involved in 19 other cases, however, in the present case, the petitioner is inside the jail since 07.12.2019, i.e., for a period of about 05 years and 03 months.

It is further submitted that proceedings in the present FIR case stand stayed before the learned trial Court by virtue of order dated 20.05.2024 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the quashing petition filed by co-accused – Maan Singh, i.e., CRM-M-24507-2024 titled as “Maan Singh v. State of Punjab and another”, whereby proceedings before the learned trial Court were ordered to be adjourned beyond the date fixed before this Court.

In support of his contention, learned counsel has produced a copy of the aforesaid order dated 20.05.2024, which is taken on record.

4. Learned counsel further submits that on account of the stay of proceedings before the learned trial Court, even the statement of injured/complainant – Prabhjit Singh, as directed by this Court vide order dated 23.02.2026 passed in the present case, could not be recorded.

Thus, in the given circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.



5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 22.04.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. The office is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that keeping in view the gravity of the offence as well as the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve any leniency and, thus, prays for dismissal of the present petition.

However, other factual assertions noticed here-above have not been disputed by learned State counsel.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have perused the relevant material available on record.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, it is noticed that the proceedings before the learned trial Court stand stayed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court. Consequently, the trial is not in a position to proceed further any further.

It is further a matter of record that petitioner is inside the jail since 07.12.2019, i.e., for about a period of 05 years and 03 months. Thus, keeping in view the prolonged period of incarceration already undergone by the petitioner and the fact that trial proceedings remain stalled on account of the stay order operating in connected proceedings, this Court does not find any substantial reason to continue with the detention of the petitioner inside the jail for an indefinite period.

9. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this



Court is of the considered view that further detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose.

Accordingly, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. The observation made here-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

12. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is found indulged in similar kind of activities, prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail in the present case.

13. **Petition stands disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 23, 2026

J.Ram

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