



114+215+291

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CRM-M-4354-2026 (O&M)

Nishan SinghPetitioner

versus

State of Haryana Respondent

2. CRM-M-27862-2026

Sukhveer Singh @ Sukhvir Singh @ Sukhpreet Singh
....Petitioner

versus

State of HaryanaRespondent

Date of decision: 21.05.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. L.S. Bhullar, Advocate (in CRM-M-4354-2026)
Mr. Balraj Singh Sidhu, Advocate (in CRM-M-27862-2026)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

CRM-22625-2026 in CRM-M-4354-2026

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Annexure A-1 is taken on record.

CRM-13823-2026 in CRM-M-4354-2026

Prayer in the present application is for early hearing of the
main case.

As the main case is listed today, the present application for
early hearing is disposed of as infructuous.



Main cases

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.
2. Present petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.519 dated 27.10.2024, under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 109(1), 115(2), 117(2), 126(2), 238, 351(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Dabwali, District Sirsa.
3. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the present FIR has been registered on the statement of Anmol. It was alleged that on 25.10.2024 at about 07:00 PM, after closing the shop, his father left before him on his motorcycle for their village. After some time, the complainant started riding towards the Village and he was about 100 meters away from his father. When he reached near Saktakheda Minor, a silver-coloured Zen car with a Delhi registration number approached him from the opposite direction. It was alleged that the driver of that car deliberately attempted to hit his father's motorcycle and as the complainant reached closer, he confronted the driver. The complainant recognized the driver as Nishan (petitioner in CRM-M-4354-2026). When his father objected again then Nishan along with Deepak @ Deepu, Arshdeep, Sukhpreet (petitioner in CRM-M-27862-2026) and 2-3 other unidentified persons, came out of the car. It was alleged that Nishan was armed with pistol, Deepak was armed with Kappa, Arshdeep was armed with iron rod, Sukhpreet was armed with kappa and others were armed with iron rods and sticks. It was alleged that Nishan fired from his pistol but the shot misfired. On the instructions of Nishan, Deepak, Arshdeep, Sukhpreet and others attacked the father of



the complainant by using their respective weapons. It was alleged that during this incident, father of the complainant suffered severe injuries on his left shoulder, legs, waist and head and when complainant tried to intervene, the accused persons started beating the complainant. Thereafter, when the co-villagers of the complainant reached the spot, the accused persons fled away from the spot along with their respective weapons and threatened the father of the complainant. Request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. Thus, the FIR was registered and investigation commenced and the petitioners were arrested on 10.01.2025. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioners approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the same were declined vide orders dated 20.10.2025 and 19.03.2026, respectively. Being aggrieved, petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petition for grant of concession of regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of co-accused, namely, Deepak @ Deepu. They have drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 20.01.2026 passed by this Court in CRM-M-45583-2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioners, namely, Deepak @ Deepu has been granted the concession of regular bail. They have submitted that case of the petitioners is at par with the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court. They have further submitted that on the basis of the parity, the petitioners deserve to be granted bail. They have also submitted that the petitioners are behind the bars from last 1½ year.

5. It is contended by learned counsel for petitioner-Nishan Singh that though the petitioner was alleged to have fired, however, there



is no firearm injury to anyone in the present case.

6. It is contended by learned counsel for petitioner-Sukhveer Singh @ Sukhvir Singh @ Sukhpreet Singh that petitioner was allegedly armed with *kapa* but the injury attributed to him does not fall for the offence under Section 109 of BNS. It is thus, submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioners deserve to be released on bail on the basis of parity.

7. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. However, he has endorsed the fact that case of the petitioners are at par with co-accused, namely, Deepak @ Deepu, who has already been granted bail by this Court. On instructions, he has submitted that challan has been presented, charges have been framed. He has produced custody certificate of petitioner-Sukhveer Singh, today in the Court, which is taken on record.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners are behind bars since the date of their arrest. The custody certificate produced would show that petitioner-Sukhveer Singh has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 04 months and 10 days as on 19.05.2026. It further reflects that though he is involved in 07 other cases, however, in 02 cases, he is on bail; in 01 case, he has undergone the sentence; in 01 case, he has been acquitted. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Deepak @ Deepu, has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 20.01.2026.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take



sufficiently long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail on the basis of parity with co-accused, Deepak @ Deepu, who has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 20.01.2026 passed in CRM-M-45583-2025. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their 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.

10. If the petitioners do not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then their further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present cases.

21.05.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No