



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

217

CRM-M-15874-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision : 14.05.2026

Manvir Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Hakam Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Ajayveer Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, DAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This petition for bail, which is first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.105 dated 21.12.2024, newly added under Sections 113(1) and 113(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, not correspondence Sections in IPC, 1860 Section 9(B) of the Explosive Act, 1884, Section 5 of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908 and Section 25(1) of the Arms Act, 1959, Police Station Behram, District SBS Nagar.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Inspector/SHO Rajiv Kumar'. It was reported by the abovenamed police officer that on 21.12.2024, while he was leading a team of police officials deputed for patrolling duty, Inspector Davinder Singh posted in Counter



Intelligence Unit Jalandhar along with his team met him. As per abovenamed police officer Inspector Davinder Singh shared an information with him and told that a reliable source had given him a tip-off that terrorist belonging to Babbar Khalsa International, Harwinder Singh Rinda had been sending large consignment of arms and ammunitions through Pakistan border by drone and that his close associates, namely Gurpreet Singh @Gopi Nawa Sheharia and Jaspreet Singh @Jassi were receiving the abovementioned consignment. According to abovenamed police officer, it was also informed that in the recent past also, they had received big consignments of arms and ammunitions and that on that day Manvir Singh (the petitioner herein) was carrying arms and ammunition on scooter make Activa bearing Registration No.PB32T-8369.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned information, the team comprising of abovenamed police officials went to Sarangwal village Munna side and apprehended Manvir Singh along with his scooty. As per prosecution from the boot of the scooty one hand grenade along with IED (Improvised Explosive Device) was recovered. As per prosecution pursuant to recovery of abovementioned explosive device, requisite formalities with regard to seizure and sealing of abovementioned device, formal arrest of the accused and registration of FIR was undertaken and further investigation taken up.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed by learned State Counsel. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.



6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner who has clean antecedents has already suffered a prolonged incarceration, in the present case, as he is in custody for a period of more than one year and four months. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, the trial is taking place at a very slow pace as out of 24 prosecution witnesses only four have been examined so far. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that as per case developed by the prosecution, the petitioner was acting upon the instructions of co-accused Karamjit Singh and that co-accused Karamjit Singh has already been accorded the benefit of bail by the Co-ordinate Bench, vide order dated 13.02.2026 in CRM-M-69269-2025. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that the petitioner had no intention to indulge in any kind of terrorist activity and he was simply acting upon the instructions of Karamjit Singh, who is already on bail, and therefore, the petitioner, too, is entitled to the benefit of bail.

7. The learned State Counsel has controverted the abovementioned arguments. According to learned State Counsel in the present case there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner for being in possession of explosive device, and that the recovery had taken place pursuant to a tip-off given to a police officer posted in Counter Intelligence Unit of Punjab Police. It has also been contended by learned State Counsel that the case of the petitioner stands on a different footing in comparison to the case of co-accused Karamjit Singh as nothing was recovered from the possession of co-accused Karamjit Singh and that the only evidence collected by the Investigating Agency, against him, was the disclosure statement of co-accused. In view of abovementioned



arguments, the learned State Counsel has contended that the case of the petitioner stands on a different footing, and that in view of serious nature of the offence & its gravity the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of bail.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

9. A perusal of record shows that there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner that he was found in possession of one grenade along with IED device. Since the recovery of abovementioned explosive device has taken place from possession of petitioner and similar allegation were not there against the co-accused Karamjit Singh, it is hereby observed that the case of present petitioner does not stand on parity with the co-accused Karamjit Singh. Otherwise also, in view of gravity of offence and the fact that the trial is taking place at a reasonable pace, it is hereby observed that the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of bail. Thus, it is hereby held that the present petition being devoid of merit deserves dismissal.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is hereby ***dismissed***. However it is clarified that the abovementioned observations shall not have any bearing upon the merits of the case.

11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

14.05.2026

Vinod

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No