



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

211

CRA-D-248-2026
Date of decision: 02.07.2026

SUKHVIR SINGH @ VICKY

.....Appellant

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present: - Mr. A.P.S. Shergill, Advocate and
Ms. Anisha Singh, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant appeal has been preferred against the order dated 22.01.2026 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana whereby the second application for seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 192 dated 05.12.2022 registered under Sections 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 384, 386, 173, 506, 473 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 17, 18 and 20 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act added later on) at Police Station City Khanna, Ludhiana, had been dismissed.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant contends that the instant case was registered pursuant to arrest of one Mahinder Verma @ DK and Ramesh from whom weapons viz. .32 bore pistol and 08 live cartridges and .315 bore pistol with 02 live cartridges were recovered respectively. On the disclosure statement of Ramesh Kumar, Gurjant Singh @ Janty and Sandeep Singh @ Shelly were nominated as an accused and they were arrested on 10.12.2022. Recovery of 10 live cartridges each of .9 MM was effected from the said co-accused as well. The name of the appellant appeared in the disclosure statement of co-accused Gurjant Singh @ Janty and he was also arrested on 10.12.2022 and at the instance of the appellant, a .45 bore pistol was recovered from an under-construction house.

3. Counsel submits that the appellant herein has remained in custody since 10.12.2022. It is contended that he was not named in the FIR and was implicated only on a subsequent disclosure by the co-accused. He further submits that the recovery having been effected from an under construction house cannot, by itself, conclusively establish the appellant's conscious possession of the said weapon and the evidentiary value as well as the appellant's link with the recovered weapon would be an issue to be adjudicated during the course of the trial. It is further contended that the co-accused Gurjant Singh @ Janty, at whose instance the appellant was nominated as an accused, has already been granted the concession of bail vide order dated 16.12.2024 passed in CRA-D-1212 of 2023 and that the case of the appellant would in any case be at par with the said co-accused.

4. Learned State Counsel fairly concedes that apart from the difference of the recovery that has been effected, the substantive role of the

appellant would be at par with the said co-accused Gurjant Singh @ Janty. It is also not disputed by him that the appellant herein has already undergone an actual custody of more than three and a half years and only 07 out of 62 witnesses have been examined so far. Thus, the trial is likely to take long time to conclude.

5. We have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended with the present petition.

6. Taking into consideration that similarly placed co-accused Gurjant Singh @ Janty has already been granted concession of regular bail by this court vide order dated 16.12.2024 passed in CRA-D-1212 of 2023 by a co-ordinate bench of this court, the period of custody undergone by the appellant being more than three and half years as an undertrial prisoner, the reasons assigned by this Court in its order dated 16.10.2024 passed in CRA-D-1212 of 2023 coupled with the stage of the trial and bearing in mind that material issues would arise for consideration during the course of trial which is still at a nascent stage, we deem it appropriate to enlarge the appellant on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant appeal is allowed and the appellant is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the appellant shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

02.07.2026
Vishal Sharma

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No