



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-18108-2026
Decided on : 09.04.2026

Anmoldeep Singh @ Rana . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Anmoldeep Singh @ Rana	31	12.03.2025	109, 351(2), 190 of BNS, 2023 (307, 506, 149 of IPC) and 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959	Cantonment	Amritsar

2. FIR in the present case has been registered at the instance of complainant – Harpal Singh @ Bhala. The alleged incident took place on 10.03.2025 at about 11:00–11:15 PM. As per the allegations, accused Karan @ DR fired two shots from his pistol in the air and one shot towards the complainant – Harpal Singh @ Bhala, which hit the left side of his pelvic bone. Petitioner along with other co-accused, namely, (i) Karan @ DR, (ii) Ranjeet Singh @ Love, (iii) Balwant Singh @ Sodhi, and (iv) Bittu @



Bhaiya, allegedly extended threats and thereafter all of them fled away on their motorcycles after pelting stones and bricks on the complainant party.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner, except of giving threats and pelting stones/bricks. He is in custody since 09.06.2025, i.e., for a period of about 09 months and 25 days. Nothing remains to be recovered from him and no incriminating material has been recovered during the course of investigation. It is further submitted that the alleged use of firearm has been attributed solely to co-accused Karan @ DR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the main accused, i.e., Karan @ DR, has been extended the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 10.03.2026, passed in CRM-M-68645-2025 (O&M), titled as, *“Karanjeet Singh @ Karan D.R. v. State of Punjab”* (Annexure P-2).

Besides, petitioner is seeking parity with the other co-accused, namely, Ranjeet Singh @ Love and Balwant Singh @ Sodhi, who have also been granted concession of regular bail by this Court vide common order dated 05.03.2026, passed in CRM-M-51621-2025, titled as, *“Ranjeet Singh @ Love and another v. State of Punjab”* (Annexure P-4).

Apart this, learned counsel submits that complainant has also compromise the matter with the accused persons (including petitioner), vide compromise dated 23.10.2025 (P-3), wherein, it has been specifically stated that all the disputes have been settled down between the parties, who resides in the same locality and thus, complainant does not want to pursue the proceedings.



Accordingly, in the given circumstances, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificates dated 08.04.2026 in Court today. Same are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate places.

Copies thereof have also been handed over to the opposite counsel.

6. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the allegations in the present case are serious in nature, as the complainant has sustained a firearm injury on the left side of his pelvic bone.

It is further submitted that the accused persons had acted in furtherance of their common intention and had also pelted stones and bricks upon the complainant party before fleeing from the spot.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factual aspects noticed here-above, particularly the period of custody undergone by the petitioner and the fact that the alleged firing has been attributed to co-accused Karan @ DR, who has already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court.

7. Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and the material available on record, it is noticed that the specific role of causing firearm injury has been attributed to co-accused Karan @ DR, whereas the role assigned to the present petitioner is limited in nature, i.e., of extending threats and allegedly pelting stones/bricks.

It is further a matter of record that the main accused, namely Karan @ DR, as well as other co-accused, namely Ranjeet Singh @ Love



and Balwant Singh @ Sodhi, have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. Thus, case of the present petitioner stands on a similar footing and deserves consideration on the ground of parity.

It is also not disputed that the petitioner is inside the jail since 09.06.2025, i.e., for a period of about 09 months and 25 days and nothing remains to be recovered from him.

Further, the factum of compromise between the parties, though not determinative in cases of serious nature, is a relevant circumstance for the limited purpose of considering the prayer for bail.

8. Keeping in view the nature of allegations, role attributed to the petitioner, principle of parity, period of incarceration already undergone, and the stage of trial, and also without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that further detention of the petitioner inside the jail would not serve any useful purpose. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not



be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 09, 2026
J.Ram

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