



CRM-M-22453-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-22453-2026

Date of Decision: 06.05.2026

Kuljinder Singh @ Kalu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.08 dated 20.01.2026, registered under Sections 310(4) and 310(5) of BNS, 2023, at Police Station Mamdot, District Ferozepur.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that on 17.01.2026 the police party while on patrolling received a secret information to the effect that Vikram @ Vicky, Kuljinder Singh @ Kalu, Manjit Singh, Sanjiv @ Happy, Ram Kilawan were in possession of kappa, swords and other weapons and were planning to commit serious offence. On receiving the information, raid was conducted at the place disclosed and the petitioner alongwith the other co-accused were apprehended. The FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. On completion of the investigation, the challan was filed. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 11.02.2026. Hence, the



CRM-M-22453-2026

-2-

petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He contends that the petitioner has been roped in the present case on the basis of the secret information for the allegation that he alongwith the co-accused was planning for dacoity. He submits that neither the petitioner was present at the place of occurrence nor he was armed with any weapon. However, in a pre-planned manner, the petitioner alongwith the co-accused have been roped in the present case. He submits that the petitioner has never been involved in any other case of the similar nature, though he is involved in one more FIR under the NDPS Act, however, he is on bail in the same. He submits that the investigation is complete and the petitioner is behind the bars from 20.01.2026. He, thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that on the basis of specific secret information, the petitioner alongwith the co-accused was arrested and a sword was recovered from the petitioner. On instructions, he submits that the investigation is complete and challan has been presented, however, charges are yet to be framed. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrested in the present case on the



CRM-M-22453-2026

-3-

basis of the secret information. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 03 months & 15 days as on 05.05.2026. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is not involved in any other case of the similar nature, however, in one case pending against him, he is on bail. Investigation is complete.

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. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, 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.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.05.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No