



243

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

**CRM-M No.68702 of 2025
Date of Decision: 11.12.2025**

Roshan Singh @ Harroshan Nath**..... 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. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing 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 and any other sections added later on.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the police party while on patrolling on 14.01.2025, received a secret information to the effect 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 reached the



place as 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. Thus, the FIR was registered and the co-accused were arrested on the spot. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 02.07.2025. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 20.10.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner has approached 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, Vishavjeet Singh @ Vishavdeep Singh @ Vishu. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 14.11.2025,



passed in **CRM-M-62832-2025**, whereby, co-accused, namely, Vishavjeet Singh @ Vishavdeep Singh @ Vishu has been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 02.07.2025. He has submitted 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, Vishavjeet Singh @ Vishavdeep Singh @ Vishu. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

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, Vishavjeet Singh @ Vishavdeep Singh @ Vishu is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 05 months & 06 days as on 10.12.2025. It further reveals that the petitioner is involved in 09 other cases, out of which, in three cases, he has been convicted however in 01 case, his sentence has been completed and in 02 cases, he has already undergone the sentence. However in 02 cases, he has been acquitted and in 01 case, he has been discharged.

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.

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

8. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

14.11.2025

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

:

Yes/No