



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

CRM-M-19969-2026

Date of Decision: 29.04.2026

Ajay Singh Rath

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Ekta Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting him regular bail in case FIR No.173 dated 27.07.2024, under Sections 309(4), 311, 317(2) of BNS and Sections 25, 54 & 59 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Samrala, Police District Khanna, Ludhiana.

2. As per the facts of the present case, the present FIR has been registered on the statement of Lakhveer Singh. It was alleged that on 27.07.2024, when he was present at Petrol Pump near Big Resort Lalodi Kalan Khanna Samrala Road, where he was working since 03 years, at around 1:55 pm, one Swift grey coloured car and one Pulsar motorcycle came there, in which Lovejeet Singh @ Lavi Mann, Krishna Sahni, Jatin Moonga and Ajay Singh Rath (present petitioner), were sitting and two persons were on the motorcycle. It was further alleged that Krishna Sahni asked for Rs.500/- worth of petrol and upon payment being delayed, co-accused Jatin Moonga pointed a pistol and threatened the complainant and in the meanwhile, Krishna Sahni snatched the money bag from the complainant and ran away on their respective



vehicles along with the weapon. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrested on 27.07.2024. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 28.10.2024. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-25696-2025, however, same was dismissed as withdrawn on 15.05.2025. Hence, he is before this Court by way of filing of present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused. She has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 19.03.2026 passed by this Court in **CRM-M-62847-2025**, whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Lovedeep Singh @ Lovepreet Singh @ Lovejeet Singh @ Lavi Mann, has been granted the concession of bail. She has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with that of the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court. She submits that on the basis of the parity, petitioner deserves to be granted bail as case of the petitioner is similar to that of the co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. However, he endorsed the fact that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Lovedeep Singh @ Lovepreet Singh @ Lovejeet Singh @ Lavi Mann, has already been granted bail by this Court. He has produced custody certificate of petitioner, today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the



record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrested on 27.07.2024. Material witnesses already stand examined. Custody certificate filed by the State would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 08 months and 08 days as on 28.04.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Lovedeep Singh @ Lovepreet Singh @ Lovejeet Singh @ Lavi Mann, has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 19.03.2026.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Thus, keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

29.04.2026

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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