



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

219

**CRM-M-19878-2026
Date of decision: 20.04.2026**

YASHMAN SINGH @ YASHMAN @ AMNAPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

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

Present: - Ms. Ramandeep Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant second petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 138 dated 23.10.2023, registered under Section(s) 307, 148, 149, 506, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25(6), 25(7), 25(8) of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Nihal Singh Wala, District Moga.

2. The present FIR has been registered on the statement of Harwinder Singh @ Bindru son of Ajaib Singh to the effect that on 23.10.2023, the complainant was descending into the courtyard of his house to have his morning tea when someone knocked at the main gate. Upon being informed that some persons were waiting outside, the complainant proceeded to the gate to inquire. It is alleged that upon reaching outside, he found two

unknown young persons with their faces covered, riding a black Pulsar motorcycle without any number plate or registration. One of them was holding a cage containing two pigeons and, upon being questioned, stated that their pigeons had flown into the village. In the meantime, the other person, who was seated on the motorcycle, allegedly took out a pistol and fired 3–4 shots at the complainant. On the basis of the aforesaid statement, the present FIR was registered.

3. It is further a matter of record that the petitioner was taken into custody and was subsequently granted the concession of regular bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga, vide order dated 05.04.2024, inter alia, noticing that the complainant had not supported the prosecution version and had specifically stated that it was not the petitioner who had fired any shot or intended to cause harm to him. However, thereafter, the petitioner absented himself from the proceedings with effect from 22.07.2024 and was declared a proclaimed offender on 02.07.2025. He was subsequently arrested on 13.10.2025 in connection with another case at Patiala.

4. Counsel contends that the petitioner is in custody in the present case since October, 2025. The very fact that the complainant already turned hostile, there is no reason why the custodial detention of the petitioner should be prolonged any further.

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

6. Having have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, the fact that the complainant–injured has not supported the prosecution case, as also noticed in the order granting bail dated

05.04.2024 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga, coupled with the period of custody undergone thereafter, and further bearing in mind the young age of the petitioner, being about 21 years, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. 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.

9. 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 20, 2026

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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