



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.

221

CRM-M-27964-2026 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 21.05.2026.

Harwinder Singh

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Haryana

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Pranav Juneja, Advocate
Mr. Rohit K. Arora, Advocate and
Ms. Yashika Walia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Harwinder Singh	365	26.08.2025	109(1) of BNS and 25 of Arms Act (111(2)(B), 308(4), 61(2), 238(C) BNS added later on).	Ladwa	Kurukshetra

2. As per allegations, the FIR in the present case was got registered at the instance of complainant-Amandeep, he has a liquor shop at Indri Chowk Ladwa, and after murder of his friend Shantanu, he had been receiving

extortion and life threats, from foreign numbers. Due to the threats, complainant-Amandeep was provided security guards to protect his life. On 26.08.2025, one unknown person, reached on the shop and did show a pistol like weapon and pointed a pistol like weapon towards employees sitting in the liquor shop, with an intention to kill. When the Constable-Naveen (Security Guard) and another one Ravi Chand Upadhyay were apprised of the situation, they came outside and thereafter chased the persons, however, he succeeded in fleeing.

During the course of investigation, some more facts were surfaced that accused Satnam Singh is father of one accused Lovepreet, who is involved in number of cases and at some point of time, petitioner, who is a shooter was provided shelter by co-accused Satnam Singh and even accused Lovepreet had sent him at the shop to terrorize complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the allegations are false and petitioner has no connection with the crime as alleged by the complainant. Counsel further submits that material witnesses PW-2 Gurwinder Singh and PW-3 HC Naveen Kumar have already been examined, however, from their deposition, it does not come out clearly, if they have identified the petitioner to be the actual accused. Further submits that involvement of the petitioner is yet to be determined because his name was not mentioned in the FIR, rather he was involved as an accused only on the basis of unauthentic secret information. Co-accused Satnam Singh has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court, vide order dated 30.03.2026 (Annexure P-13). Thus, counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody

certificate dated 20.05.2026. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place with the paper book.

Learned State counsel opposed the bail on the ground that keeping in view the nature of offence committed by the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of bail.

4. I have considered the submissions addressed by the respective counsel.

5. Petitioner has been involved in this case only on the basis of secret information and is inside jail since 06.09.2025 and conclusion of trial will consume considerable, this Court deems it appropriate to consider the plea of bail to the petitioner as further incarceration of the petitioner inside the jail without proving of charges would be improper.

Considering the above said circumstances in totality, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

Consequently, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular 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.

6. Needless to observe 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 here-in-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.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

9. **Petition stands disposed of accordingly.**

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

21.05.2026
jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No
Whether Reportable : Yes/ No