

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215

2026:PHHC:061318



CRM-M-16729-2026 (O&M).
Date of decision: 22.04.2026.

VIKRAMJIT SINGH ALIAS KAKA

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

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

PRESENT Mr. Angel Walia, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in
case bearing FIR No.119 dated 07.06.2024, under Section(s) 379-B(2) of the
Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section(s) 411 and 34 of the IPC added later on),
registered at Police Station Sadar, District Amritsar.

Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case
are that on 07.06.2024, at approximately 6:30 p.m., the complainant was
proceeding on foot towards Batala Road. Upon reaching near Mustafabad,
close to the Power Station on a deserted stretch of road, he was allegedly
surrounded by six unknown young men. One of them was carrying a knife,

while the others were empty-handed. They demanded that he hand over whatever belongings he had. One of the assailants allegedly drew a chhura (knife) from his waistband, placed it on the complainant's neck, and the others searched his pockets, forcibly taking away his mobile phone make a REALME 8i from the pocket of his jeans. The complainant stated that upon his raising an alarm, the six individuals fled, and he chased after them. As he ran behind them, bystanders in the locality purportedly identified the six youths as Veeru, son of Kundan Lal; Panni, son of Tarsem Singh; Sawan @ Kalu, son of Jasbir Singh; Raja @ Jasarah, son of Satwinder Singh; Kaka, son of Labh Singh (the present petitioner); and Karan @ Kala—all residents of Mustafabad, Amritsar. The complainant further stated that since the assailants' faces were uncovered, he would be able to identify them upon being confronted.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 08.06.2024 and has already undergone custody of 01 year and 10 months. He contends that out of total 11 witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 01 witness has been examined so far and thus conclusion of trial shall take a long time. He further contends that co-accused of the petitioner namely Mohit Kumar @ Veeru has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 28.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-65859-2025.

State counsel, on the other hand, does not dispute the facts noticed above.

Having heard the counsel for the respective parties and without commenting anything on the merits of the present case and further taking into

consideration the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the role attributed to the petitioner, the stage of the trial where only 01 witness has been examined so far and also the fact that co-accused Mohit Kumar @ Veeru has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 28.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-65859-2025, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

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.

April 22, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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