



2026:PHHC:046136

2026:PHHC:046136



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

121

CRM-M-61777-2025
Date of decision: 24.03.2026

SATPAL SINGH @ PALA FOJI

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

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

Present: - Mr. Parminder Singh Sekhon, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Parshant, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Narender Singh Kamboj, Advocate
for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 107 dated 03.06.2025, registered under Section(s) 109, 115(2), 126(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Patran, District Patiala.

2. Succinctly stated, the case of the prosecution is that on 02.06.2025 at about 6:00 p.m., the complainant Gundershan Singh, son of Rajinder Singh, was at his residence when the accused Satpal Singh alias Pala Fauji (petitioner herein) son of Shiv Singh, accompanied by his two



sons, Nirmal Singh alias Langra and Gurjeet Singh, arrived at the field on a tractor being driven by Gurjeet Singh. The accused persons commenced ploughing their portion of land and, in the process, encroached upon the adjoining land of the complainant by ploughing approximately half a killa thereof, in addition to ploughing about two kanals of their own share. During this act, the accused, without any provocation, hurled abuses and threatened the complainant. The complainant and his family, fearing confrontation, refrained from making any response and decided to resolve the matter later with the help of respected elders of the village. Thereafter, the accused persons departed the place on the tractor at about 7:00 p.m. Subsequently, at approximately 7:00 p.m., the complainant proceeded on his scooter bearing registration No. PB-65-AM-7645 to drop his uncle Gyan Singh at his residence. After doing so, while returning home, while he was passing near the house of Ram Singh, Secretary at about 7:30 p.m., the complainant noticed that the accused Satpal Singh alias Pala Fauji was standing there along with his sons Nirmal Singh alias Langra and Gurjeet Singh. As per the prosecution version, the accused persons surrounded the complainant and his scooter. Upon alighting from the scooter, the injured addressed his uncle regarding the dispute. At that moment, the accused Satpal Singh alias Pala Fauji drew a licensed revolver from his waist and discharged it with the intent of killing the complainant. The first shot is stated to have passed over the complainant's head, the second is stated to have passed by his neck and the third struck him above his left thigh. Thereafter, Gurjeet Singh and Nirmal Singh picked up a stones and both of them struck the complainant on his head. Hence, the present FIR was registered at Police Station Patran and investigation commenced.



3. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that there are only two injuries on the person of the complainant-injured-Gurdarshan Singh i.e. a brick injury and a gun fire shot injury on the left thigh. He contends that there was no gunshot graze injury on the neck and the same has been wrongly recorded in the order dismissing the bail passed by the Additional District & Sessions Judge, Patiala. He further contends that the petitioner was taken into custody on 14.06.2025 and has already undergone an actual custody of more than 09 months. It is submitted that the petitioner is a 65 years old individual with clean antecedents and is not involved in any other case. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is complete and the challan has been filed on 11.09.2025. It is however contended that the trial is at a nascent stage and charges have yet not been framed and there are 22 witnesses to be examined by the prosecution to prove its case thus, the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude. It is vehemently argued that the custodial detention of the petitioner is not likely to advance any further interest of justice as it is a case of version and cross version over a land dispute *inter se* between the petitioner as well as the complainant and that a cross version for commission of offences under Sections 323 and 324 has also been registered against the respondent-complainant herein.

4. Counsel for the respondent-State as well as the complainant contend that the petitioner has been attributed three gun fire shots out of which two of them passed over the head and by the neck. It is, thus conceded that none of the said shots caused any injury. It is, however, contended that the third shot eventually hit the thigh of the complainant-victim and that he is young boy and has sustained a serious injury.



5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Without going into the merits and considering the contentions raised by the parties and noticing the fact that it is a case of version and cross version arising out of an ongoing land dispute between the parties and a cross case has also been registered against the respondent-complainant party coupled with the age of the petitioner, his clean antecedents, the period of actual custody undergone by him and further bearing in mind the stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond 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 witnesses 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.

MARCH 24, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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