



CRM-M-62832-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-62832-2025

Date of Decision: 14.11.2025

Vishavjeet Singh @ Vishavdeep Singh @ Vishu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Balbir Kumar Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, 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.07 dated 14.01.2025 under Sections 109, 132, 221, 191, 190 of BNS, and Section 25 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Smalsar, District Moga.
2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that on 14.01.2025, the Police received a secret information that Harvinder Singh @ Happy was standing alongwith his companions, who on previous night had caused injuries to a shopkeeper, namely, Karamjit. They were preparing to cause some another incident and were armed with deadly weapons. On receiving the secret information, a raiding team was constituted and approached the place disclosed. On reaching there, six young persons were found standing on the spot. One of them fired at the police from the pistol which he was holding. In retaliation, the police also fired from their service revolvers. One young person ran away in the wheat field and the remaining five persons managed



to escape on two motorcycles. The Police apprehended the person who went hiding in the wheat field. On asking, he disclosed his name as Amandeep Singh. Thereafter, the police party nabbed one more person, who disclosed his name as Sukhchain Singh. By the firing of the Police, Sukhchain Singh suffered a bullet injury in his thigh. The FIR was registered and the co-accused were arrested on the spot. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced and the petitioner was arrested on 02.07.2025. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, learned Court declined the bail petition filed by the petitioner vide order dated 20.10.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of 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, Harpreet Singh @ Happy. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 11.07.2025, passed in **CRM-M-34760-2025**, whereby, co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Happy has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is behind bars since 02.07.2025. 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, Harpreet Singh @ Happy. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.



CRM-M-62832-2025

-3-

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 02.07.2025. Co-accused, namely, Harpreet Singh @ Happy is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate of the petitioner would reveal that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 04 months & 09 days as on 13.11.2025. It further reveals that the petitioner is involved in three other cases, out of which in one case, he is on bail.

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.

8. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

14.11.2025*ps-I***(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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