



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

CRM-M No.15259 of 2026

Date of decision: 29.04.2026

Harmanjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Yajur Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab
for the respondent-State.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023/Section 439 Cr.P.C., 1973 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.07 dated 10.01.2025 (Annexure P-1), registered under Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908 at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Brief facts of the case are that on 10.01.2025, SI Gopal Singh received a secret information to the effect that accused Harmandeep Singh, Rohit and Harmanjit Singh had formed a gang and were involved in receiving grenades and other explosive material through drones from Pakistan for supplying the same in the area of Amritsar. It was further informed that on the said day, accused Harmanjit Singh and Rohit were coming from the border side towards Amritsar on motorcycle bearing



registration No. PB-02-EY-1448 along with grenade and explosive material and if a raid would be conducted, they could be apprehended red-handed. Acting upon the said information, the police party immediately took action and apprehended accused Harmanjit Singh and Rohit, and during search, recovery of one hand grenade was effected from co-accused Rohit. Accordingly, the present FIR came to be registered against the accused persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that only one hand grenade was allegedly recovered in the present case and the same was recovered from co-accused Rohit, while the co-accused and the petitioner were travelling together on a motorcycle. It is further contended that the petitioner is in custody for the last one year, three months and twelve days. It has been submitted that the investigation in the present case already stands completed, challan has been presented, charges have been framed and out of 13 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. On the strength of the aforesaid submissions, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed status report, which is taken on the record and opposed the present petition by contending that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It has been argued that the petitioner, along with co-accused Rohit, was apprehended and recovery of a hand grenade was effected from co-accused Rohit, which was allegedly procured from Pakistan through drone. It is further submitted that serious offences under the provisions of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908 are involved and the material



prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The allegations levelled against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature. Though the petitioner seeks to claim benefit on the ground that the actual recovery was effected from co-accused Rohit, however, as per the prosecution case, both the accused persons were apprehended together pursuant to a specific secret information and the recovered hand grenade is alleged to have been procured from Pakistan through drone for further supply in the area of Amritsar. The nature of allegations *prima-facie* reflects serious implications concerning public safety and security. Moreover, the material prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined and at this stage, the possibility of influencing the prosecution evidence cannot be ruled out.

7. Considering the seriousness of allegations and the stage of trial, this Court does not find any ground to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

29.04.2026
neetu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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