



CRM-M-5510-2026 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205

CRM-M-5510-2026
Decided on : 09.04.2026

YADWINDER SINGH ALIAS YADA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Yadwinder Singh @ Yada, aged about 29 years	107	22.12.2024	308(4), 351(2) of BNS (sections 109, 61(2), 132, 221 BNS and 25, 27, 54, 56 of	Chohla Sahib	Tarn Taran



			Arms added on)	Act later		
--	--	--	----------------	-----------	--	--

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the version put forth by the complainant in the FIR is grossly delayed, as the alleged threat call that gave rise to the occurrence is stated to have taken place on 18.12.2024, whereas FIR was registered only on 22.12.2024. It is further submitted that petitioner has not been attributed any overt act, and case is one of no injury. No specific role has been assigned to the petitioner in the initial version.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner has been implicated solely on the basis of the supplementary statement made by the complainant on 25.12.2024, which itself is based on the alleged secret information.

Four accused named in the supplementary statement, i.e. Yadwinder Singh @ Yada (petitioner herein), Prabhdeep Singh alias Judge, Kuldeep Singh @ Laddu and Angrej Singh.

It is also submitted that the petitioner is in custody for a period of 1 year 3 months and 6 days, and *challan* has already been presented before the competent court.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that similarly situated co-accused Prabhdeep Singh alias Judge, has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 16.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-35886-2025 (Annexure P-3).



Similarly, co-accused, namely Kuldeep Singh @ Laddu, has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 11.09.2025, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran.

4. Additionally, it is submitted that in the supplementary statement, incident of firing at the door of the complainant's house was alleged to be happened on 21.12.2024, whereas in the FIR which was registered on 22.12.2024, no such fact of firing shots at the complainant's house, was disclosed.

Therefore, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 08.04.2026 and status report dated 04.04.2026 in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 01 year 03 months and 06 days period inside jail.

6. Learned State Counsel, while opposing the prayer for grant of bail, submits that petitioner, along with his associates, allegedly opened fire at the complainant's house with the intent to threaten and extort money from the complainant. It is contended that such an act not only endangered the lives of innocent persons but also created a sense of fear and insecurity in the locality.

Further submits that a recovery of a .32 bore pistol has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner.



Learned State Counsel further submits that allegations against the petitioner are of a serious nature and that his release at this stage may adversely affect the ongoing investigation and trial. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the present bail petition.

7. In view of the above, and considering the fact that petitioner is in custody for a period of about 1 year and 3 months, *challan* has already been presented, and no specific or overt act has been attributed to him in the initial version of the FIR, coupled with the fact that the case is one of no injury and the implication of the petitioner is based on a delayed supplementary statement, this Court is of the opinion that further incarceration of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose. Moreover, similarly situated co-accused namely Prabhdeep Singh alias Judge and Kuldeep Singh @ Laddu, already been granted the concession of regular bail.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an



CRM-M-5510-2026 5

independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.04.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO