

2025:PHHC:128777



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

221

**CRM-M No.36947 of 2025
Date of Decision: 16.09.2025**

Sharandeep Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Angrej Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Madan Sandhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
86	30.06.2024	Subhanpur, District Kapurthala	307, 120-B and 34 of IPC and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959

2. As per the allegations, on 30.06.2024, the victim Lakhwinder Singh was going towards his house on his motorbike when 3-4 persons by riding a bike came near him and fired a shot upon him thereby causing injury. The victim had fallen down on the road. The complainant who is son of the victim came at the spot sometime thereafter and found him

2025:PHHC:128777



lying in an injured condition. Blood was oozing out of his injury. He was taken to hospital. The complainant suspected that Hardev Singh @ Bona with whom some litigation was pending, had a hand in the occurrence. On his statement, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, the accused Amritpal Singh@ Amrit who was in custody in some other case, suffered a disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the occurrence and also took the names of the present petitioner and the co-accused saying that they had participated in the occurrence and also that the victim was shot at on the asking of one Manroop Singh, resident of USA who had given a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- to them in lieu of injuring the victim. The present petitioner was nominated as an accused. He was arrested on 07.08.2024 and is in custody since then. The trial is going on.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. He is in custody since long. The co-accused Manpreet Singh @ Manna, Harpreet Singh @ Happy and Prabhjot Singh @ Prabh have been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. He has clean antecedents. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. While refuting the contentions as

2025:PHHC:128777



raised by the petitioner's counsel, it is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The case of the prosecution is that the accused Amritpal Singh had hatched a conspiracy with one Manroop Singh resident of USA to kill the victim and had further connived with the present petitioner and the co-accused. In pursuance of that conspiracy and by forming an unlawful assembly with the co-accused, the petitioner along with co-accused Harpreet Singh, Prabhjot Singh and Manpreet Singh had intercepted the victim Lakhwinder Singh. The firearm was used by the petitioner. The assailants had received an amount of Rs.1,50,000/-. The investigation stands concluded. Trial has commenced but will take considerable time to conclude. Keeping in view the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the fact that the co-accused have been extended benefit of bail, the clean antecedents of the petitioner and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that the case is made out for release of the petitioner on bail. Even otherwise, the well settled proposition of law is that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

2025:PHHC:128777



7. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

16.09.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No