



CRM-M-53645-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-53645-2025

Date of Decision: 26.09.2025

Robinjit Singh @ Robin @ J Star

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.249 dated 06.08.2023 under Sections 307, 148, 149, 452 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of Sharanjit Singh @ Katta. It was alleged that on 06.08.2023, he was present his house and at about 03:45 p.m., Harpreet Singh Happy Baba, Nannu, Robin (petitioner), Bittu Sofia Wala armed with pistol and other deadly weapons forcibly entered inside his house and asked the complainant whether Gagan has come to him or not. On denying by the complainant, Happy Baba fired gunshot on right thigh of the complainant and he fell down. Thereafter, Manpreet Singh @ Nannu fired on left thigh of the complainant. The complainant raised hue and cry and on hearing the same, people gathered and admitted the complainant to the Civil Hospital, Tarn Taran. Avinashdeep Singh @ Gagan met him in the hospital and stated that he and Gora son of Kuldeep Singh and some other children



went to watch hen fight where Happy Baba inflicted datar blow on his head. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 02.02.2025. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the petition filed by the petitioner vide order dated 24.06.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Bittu Singh @ Bittu Sofian Wala. He submits that the petitioner has been alleged to be part of the unlawful assembly and he has not been attributed any specific role. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders dated 02.05.2025 passed in **CRM-M-22421-2025**, whereby, co-accused Bittu Singh @ Bittu Sofian Wala has been granted regular bail by this Court. To buttress his arguments, he submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he is in custody since 02.02.2025. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Bittu Singh @ Bittu Sofian Wala. On instructions, she has submitted that charges have been framed and



CRM-M-53645-2025

-3-

out of total 25 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined. She has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 02.02.2025. Co-accused, namely, Bittu Singh @ Bittu Sofian Wala is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 07 months & 20 days as on 25.09.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.09.2025
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No