



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-23433-2026
Decided on : 01.05.2026

Bunty @ Vinay . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, 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
Bunty @ Vinay	184	24.07.2025	S. 109, 304(2), 115(2), 191(3), 190 & 317(2) of BNS, 2023 and S. 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959 [S. 307, 378, 379, 321, 323, 149, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414 of IPC]	Canal Colony	Bathinda

2. Incident in the present case took place on 21.07.2025 at about 9.00 p.m. and the FIR in the present case was got registered at the instance of complainant – Avi @ Goli naming therein total five accused (i) Gurmeet Singh, (ii) Mandeep Singh, (iii) Happy Tiwant (iv) Bunty @ Vinay (petitioner herein), and (v) Jaskaran Fauji.

Allegation against the petitioner is that he fired a shot after



taking revolver from co-accused – Jaskaran Fauji, which hit on the right ankle of the complainant – Avi @ Goli.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues injury attributed to the petitioner though was declared grievous, but on non-vital part of the body of the complainant. It is also argued that there are total 21 prosecution witnesses and none has been examined till date, whereas due to the slow pace of the trial proceedings, petitioner, who is at the prime age of his life, is lying inside jail for the last more than a period of 09 months (in custody since 24.07.2025). It is also submitted that injured/complainant himself involved in several other criminal cases.

Besides, learned counsel refers to order dated **24.03.2026**, passed by this Court passed in **CRM-M-56345-2025**, titled as, “*Gurmeet Singh alias Gurmeet Singh Jhansal and another v. State of Punjab*”, vide which, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Gurmeet Singh @ Gurmeet Singh Jhansal and Mandeep Singh, have already been granted concession of regular bail.

In support of his contention, learned counsel produces copy of order dated 24.03.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

Thus, in view of above and claiming parity also, learned counsel seeks concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, though keeping in view the role attributed to the petitioner, learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for bail to the petitioner, however, the factual aspects as argued by counsel for the petitioner including the involvement of injured/complainant himself in several other criminal cases, as well as the factum of granting regular bail to the co-accused vide order dated 24.03.2026, have not been disputed by



learned State counsel.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

6. In the present case, allegation against the petitioner is that he fired a shot after taking the weapon from co-accused, which hit on the right ankle of the complainant. Though, said injury has been declared grievous, but same is on a non-vital part of the body.

It is also noticeable that there are 21 prosecution witnesses and none has been examined till date. Petitioner is inside the jail since 24.07.2025, i.e., for a period of more than 09 months, and thus, conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time.

Further, the factual aspects as noticed above, including involvement of the injured/complainant in other criminal cases and the fact that co-accused, namely Gurmeet Singh @ Gurmeet Singh Jhansal and Mandeep Singh, have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court, have not been disputed by the learned State counsel.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances; particularly the nature of injury attributed to the petitioner; period of incarceration already undergone; stage of trial and the principle of parity; and without commenting upon merits of the case, this Court is of the considered view that further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Accordingly, petitioner deserves to be extended concession of regular bail.

Consequently, without making any comments over the merits of the case, the prayer for bail of the petitioner 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.

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

9. The observation made here-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 01, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No