



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

**CRM-M No.17094 of 2026
Date of decision: 26.05.2026**

Puneet Singh alias Peeta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. Present is first petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (earlier under Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.35 dated 26.02.2024 registered under Sections 307 IPC (now Section 109 BNS), 34 IPC (now Section 3(5) BNS) and Sections 25/54/59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Sadar, Amritsar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant was standing in front of the Dargah when Bablu son of Hukum Singh and another boy, whose name was not known to the complainant, came there on a Splendor motorcycle and thereafter the occurrence in question took place.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and is neither named in the



FIR nor any specific injury has been attributed to him. It is submitted that as per the prosecution version, the injury allegedly caused to the complainant has specifically been attributed to co-accused Bablu and not to the present petitioner. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner was subsequently nominated as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Bablu, wherein the petitioner has merely been shown to be the companion riding on the motorcycle. It is argued that except for the said disclosure statement, which itself is inadmissible in evidence to the extent barred by law, there is no independent evidence connecting the petitioner with the present occurrence. It is further contended that no Test Identification Parade (TIP) was ever conducted during investigation. It is also submitted that three co-accused, who were named in the disclosure statements, have already been granted concession of regular bail by learned Sessions Court vide orders dated 16.12.2025 and 07.01.2026 and, therefore, the case of the present petitioner is also liable to be considered on the ground of parity. Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner is behind bars since 31.10.2025 and the challan in the present case already stands presented. It is argued that continued incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose, particularly when the petitioner has been nominated only on the basis of disclosure statement of the main accused and no overt act has been attributed to him. It is further submitted that the bail application preferred by the petitioner before learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, was dismissed vide order dated 09.02.2026. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner undertakes not to tamper with the prosecution evidence and to abide by all



such terms and conditions as may be imposed by this Court while granting concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the present petition and submits that the petitioner played an active, deliberate and crucial role in the commission of the offence. It is argued that the petitioner was not a mere bystander, rather he was an integral part of the criminal conspiracy hatched to eliminate the complainant. Learned State counsel submits that on the day of occurrence, the petitioner accompanied the main assailant and other co-accused persons, remained present at the spot and facilitated the commission of offence by driving the motorcycle used in the crime, thereby enabling the main accused to fire upon the complainant with a country-made pistol. It is further submitted that the petitioner actively participated in the pre-planned arrangement wherein other co-accused persons were strategically positioned with weapons so as to ensure escape in case of resistance and after the firing incident, the petitioner fled away from the spot along with the co-accused, thereby demonstrating his conscious involvement and shared common intention in the commission of offence. Learned State counsel further contends that substantial and cogent incriminating evidence is available against the petitioner. His involvement, according to the prosecution, stands established from the disclosure statements suffered by co-accused persons, particularly co-accused Shivam Singh alias Bablu, who specifically named the petitioner as the person driving the motorcycle during the occurrence and assisting in execution as well as escape after the incident. It is also submitted that the petitioner himself suffered a disclosure statement



admitting his presence at the spot and his association with the other co-accused persons armed with deadly weapons. It is further argued that the complainant Gurpreet Singh Randhawa has specifically identified the petitioner as the person who was driving the motorcycle at the time of incident. Learned State counsel submits that the recovery of material evidence, medical record pertaining to firearm injury and the ongoing forensic examination further corroborate the prosecution version and establish the direct involvement of the petitioner in the offences under Sections 307/34 IPC and the Arms Act. Learned State counsel further submits that the petitioner is involved in multiple other criminal cases including offences under the Arms Act and other violent offences, which reflects his criminal antecedents and propensity to commit crime. It is argued that in case the petitioner is released on bail, there is every likelihood that he may again indulge in similar criminal activities or may abscond from trial. It is also apprehended that the petitioner may tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence and intimidate material witnesses, particularly the complainant and other witnesses belonging to the same locality. On the strength of the aforesaid submissions, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book as well as the custody certificate produced on record.

6. Without commenting upon the merits of the case lest it may prejudice either side during trial, this Court finds that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than six months. Investigation in the present case



already stands completed and challan has been presented before the competent Court.

7. This Court further finds that no specific injury has been attributed to the present petitioner. As per the prosecution version itself, the role attributed to the petitioner is that he was allegedly driving the motorcycle, whereas the firing has been attributed to co-accused Bablu. It is also not in dispute that the injuries suffered by the injured were on non-vital parts of the body.

8. This Court also cannot lose sight of the fact that co-accused Shivpreet Singh, Gursewak Singh and Harjit Singh have already been granted concession of regular bail by the competent Court. Therefore, the case of the present petitioner stands on similar footing and deserves consideration on the ground of parity as well.

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, particularly the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, the fact that no injury has been specifically attributed to him, the nature of injuries suffered by the complainant being on non-vital parts of the body, the completion of investigation and the fact that similarly situated co-accused have already been enlarged on bail, this Court is of the considered opinion that further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose.

10. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and subject to the conditions as may be imposed by the said Court.



11. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

12. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

26.05.2026

neetu

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No