



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

218 & 277

Date of decision: 12.05.2026

CRM-M-10960-2026

GURPREET SINGH @ GOPIPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CRM-M-13625-2026

HARJINDER SINGHPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Kushagra Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-10960-2026.

Mr. Ranjodh Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-13625-2026

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab
in CRM-M-10960-2026.

Ms. Alisha Soni, AAG, Punjab
in CRM-M-13625-2026.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

same FIR, are being decided by a common order.

2. The petitioner(s) herein are seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 117 dated 24.12.2025, registered under Section(s) 137(2), 3(5), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 67 B IT Act, 2000 at Police Station Verka, District Amritsar.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s) contend that at the time of filing of the present bail petitions, offences under Section 12 and 17 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 had not been added, however, during the interregnum, the said sections have also been added. They submit that the bail order, pertaining to co-accused namely Satnam Singh @ Sahkha and Amritpal Singh @ Malap to whom concession of regular bail has already been granted by the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, makes a due mention of the said Sections as well.

4. On the oral request of the counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner(s), Section 12 and 17 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012, be also read as part of the prayer clause of the present petitions.

5. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners contend that the case of the petitioners would be at par with co-accused Satnam Singh @ Sahkha and Amritpal Singh @ Malap to whom concession of regular bail has already been granted by the Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide order dated 29.04.2026 passed in BA/4121/2026 and order dated 04.04.2026 passed in BA/3080/2026 respectively. They contend that the case of the petitioners would be identically placed.

6. Learned State Counsel does not dispute the aforesaid facts.

7. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petitions.

8. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration that similarly placed co-accused have already been granted concession of regular bail, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioners on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

9. The instant petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

11. 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.

MAY 12, 2026

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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