



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

210

CRM-M-26200-2026(O&M)

Date of decision: 14.05.2026

Karanbir Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present :- Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant first petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.177 dated 02.11.2025 registered under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 [Sections 303(2), 317(2), 341(2) of BNS added later on] and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Raja Sansi, District Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the present FIR has been registered on an allegation that on 01.11.2025, the complainant Surjit Singh alongwith his son Malkiat Singh had gone to their fields for sowing wheat and at about 07:00 PM, co-accused Bikramjit Singh alongwith one unknown person came there, took out pistols from their dub and fired 8-10 shots directly upon Malkiat Singh. Thereafter, they fled away from the spot with their respective weapons. He further contends that petitioner's son Malkiat Singh was taken to hospital, however, he succumbed to the injuries so sustained. On the basis of aforesaid, the FIR was registered and co-accused Bikramjit Singh was arrested.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the disclosure statement made by co-accused Bikramjit Singh, wherein the attribution against the petitioner is solely that he had accompanied the said co-accused Bikramjit Singh, however, no specific role has been attributed to him. He further contends that even though as per the allegations, 02 persons had fired gunshots, however, the entries and shells recovered from the spot reflect that only one weapon was used and the shots were fired from one weapon only. He submits that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner, hence, the aforesaid allegations has been falsely incorporated. He further submits that there is no evidence, despite completion of investigation, to the effect that the petitioner was either sharing a common intention with the assailant or assisted him in the commission of the offence of any manner whatsoever. It is submitted that the petitioner is a young boy aged 24 years with no criminal antecedents and has been in custody since 07.11.2025.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid submissions, at this stage, however, contends that issue as regards the participation of the petitioner and role, if any, would be ascertained during the course of trial. He does not dispute at this juncture that as per the confession of Bikramjit Singh, he was carrying two illegal arms, however, only one arm was used and recovery of the said weapon has been effected.

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

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the



nature of allegations levelled against him, absence of recovery, the involvement being based on the disclosure of co-accused which is not corroborated by any recovery, his clean antecedents, his young age of 24 years as well as the fact that the investigation in the present case is complete and bearing in mind that the primarily motive as well as the actus reus is on the part of co-accused Bikramjit Singh, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition.

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.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

14.05.2026

Sumit Gusain

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

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE