



235+238

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.26321 of 2026

Vikram Singh @ Vicky

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CRM-M No.26442 of 2026

Manjeet Singh @ Manjit Singh

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

Date of decision: 14.05.2026

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. By this order, I dispose of the above mentioned two petitions arising out of the same FIR.
2. Both the petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.08, dated 20.01.2026, under Sections 310(4) and 310(5) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Mamdot, District Ferozepur.

3. Succinctly, the 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 (petitioner in CRM-M-26321-2026), Kuljinder Singh @ Kalu, Manjit Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-26442-2026), Sanjiv @ Happy, Ram Kilawan were in possession of kappa, swords and other weapons and were planning to commit serious offence. On receiving the secret information, raiding party was constituted and reached the place as disclosed in the secret information. The petitioners alongwith the other co-accused were apprehended on the spot. Thus, the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur, dismissed the bail applications filed by both the petitioners vide separate orders dated 11.02.2026. Hence, the petitioners have approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petitions.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners, at the outset, prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Kuljinder Singh @ Kalu, who has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 06.05.2026 passed in **CRM-M-22443-2026**, whereby, co-accused, namely, Kuljinder Singh @ Kalu has been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the petitioners are behind bars since 20.01.2026. He has



submitted that on the basis of the parity, the petitioners deserve to be granted bail as the case of the petitioners is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail by this Court.

5. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioners as stated above and has not denied that the petitioners are at par with the co-accused, namely, Kuljinder Singh @ Kalu. He however has opposed the same and has submitted that the petitioners were specifically named in the FIR. He has submitted that the petitioners are involved in other cases as well. He has produced custody certificate of both the petitioners today in the Court which are taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners are behind bars since 20.01.2026. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Kuljinder Singh @ Kalu is on bail and the cases of the petitioners as stated are at par with him. Custody certificates produced would show that the petitioners have suffered an incarceration of about 03 months & 20 days as on 13.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner, namely, Vikram Singh @ Vicky is involved 15 other cases as well, however in 07 of the cases, he is on bail; in 01 case, he has completed the sentence; in 04 of the cases, he has been discharged; and in 02 cases, he has been acquitted. in 01 case, he has undergone the sentence, whereas the petitioner, namely, Manjeet Singh @ Manjit Singh is involved in one more case.

8. 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.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners on the basis of parity.

10. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

11. However, if the petitioner, namely, Manjeet Singh @ Manjit Singh does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

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

14.05.2026
rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No