

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Bail Application (IA) No.1 of 2026

In

Criminal Appeal No. 18 of 2026

Prasanjeet Singh Sandhu alias Sunny Appellant

Vs.

State of Uttarakhand Respondent

Present : Mr. Vikas Anand and Ms. Gyanmati Kushwaha, Advocates for the appellant.

Mr. J.S. Virk, Deputy Advocate General for the State.

Mr. S.R.S. Gill, Advocate for the informant.

Coram : Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J.

Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J.

Hon'ble Ravindra Maithani, J. (Oral)

Instant appeal is preferred against the judgment and order dated 17.12.2025/22.12.2025, passed in Sessions Trial No.164 of 2018, State vs. Angrej Singh alias Rinku and others, by the court of Third Additional Sessions Judge, Rudrapur, District Udham Singh Nagar. By it, the appellant has been convicted under Sections 302 r/w 34, 120B, 307 r/w 34 IPC and sentenced accordingly. The appellant seeks bail during pendency of the appeal.

2. Heard on Bail Application (IA) No.1 of 2026.

3. According to the FIR, on 23.04.2018, named persons had abused and threatened the brother of the informant PW1 Mohd. Khalid, asking him to leave the Transport Nagar area. Subsequently, on 03.05.2018 at 10:20 a.m. when PW1 Mohd. Khalid was with his brother and others at Kiccha bye pass, two motorcycle borne assailants, who had masked their faces opened fire, due to which, the deceased Sameer Ahmed was hit by 3-4 bullets and subsequently, he died.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the co-accused Jasvinder Singh had already been granted bail; the role of the appellant is far better than the co-convict Jasvinder Singh in so far as the bail is concerned. It is argued that as per prosecution, the daughter of the co-convict Jasvinder Singh had transferred some money in account of the appellant, who hired the shooters, but it is argued that there is no evidence to suggest that in any manner, the appellant Prasanjeet Singh Sandhu alias Sunny was connected with any shooters.

5. Learned State Counsel submits that the money was transferred by the daughter of Jasvinder Singh in the account of the appellant, who hired the shooters.

6. The Court wanted to know, as to what is the evidence, which suggests that the appellant is connected with the alleged shooters? Learned State Counsel submits that there is evidence to it.

7. Having considered this and other attending factors of this case, we are of the view that it is a case in which the execution of sentence should be suspended and the appellant be enlarged on bail.

8. The bail application is allowed.

9. The execution of sentence, which is under challenge in this appeal shall remain suspended during the pendency of the appeal.

10. Let the appellant be released on bail, during pendency of the appeal on his executing a personal bond and furnishing two reliable sureties, each of the like amount, to the satisfaction of the court concerned.

11. List with connected cases.

(Siddhartha Sah, J.) (Ravindra Maithani, J.)
25.03.2026

Sanjay