



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-23043-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 30.04.2026

Ajaypal Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

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

Present :- Mr. Vishal Khatri, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, AAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This first petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.128 dated 04.06.2025, registered under Section(s) 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, Section 181 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 25(8) of the Arms Act, 1959 (added later on), at Police Station Lopoke, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that as per the prosecution story, on 04.06.2025, on receipt of secret information, the petitioner along with his co-accused/Rupesh Kumar Rai were apprehended. Upon search of the petitioner, one pistol along with magazine CAL 30 made and Chind Norinco inscribed thereon, was recovered and from the search of co-accused/Rupesh Kumar Rai, 100 counterfeit currency notes of the denomination of Rs.500/- each (total of Rs.50,000/-) were recovered. It is submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and he has been in

custody since 04.06.2025. He further submits that co-accused/Rupesh Kumar Rai has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 23.03.2026 passed by this Court in CRM-M-59949-2025. He contends that the case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused/Rupesh Kumar Rai, except that an offence under Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 is made out against him as he was allegedly found in possession of a pistol. It is further contended that the petitioner has undergone more custody than co-accused/Rupesh Kumar Rai and that the charges are yet to be framed and as noticed in the earlier order there were 12 prosecution witnesses remaining to be examined.

3. Learned counsel for respondent-State does not dispute the aforesaid factual aspects. She also does not dispute that the petitioner has no other criminal antecedents.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances as noted above, including co-accused/Rupesh Kumar Rai having already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 23.03.2026 passed by this Court in CRM-M-59949-2025, the period of custody undergone by the petitioner, the stage of trial, his clean antecedents, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

5. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

6. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or

indirectly.

7. 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.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

30.04.2026

Mangal Singh

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