



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M No.31716 of 2026
Date of Decision:-02.07.2026**

Sukhwinder Singh @ Sukh

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present:- Mr. Gurdarshan S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition preferred under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short the 'BNSS') is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.49 dated 18.02.2026 registered under Sections 125 and 324(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short the 'BNS') [Sections 61(2), 308(5) and 109 of the BNS added later), at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. Custody certificate filed by learned State counsel in Court is taken on record.

3. On a complaint submitted by one Gurjot Singh, the FIR in question was registered. The allegation was that on 17.02.2026, while the

complainant was asleep at his house (H. No.138, Sector 69, Mohali), some unknown persons fired multiple rounds at his house and his Mercedes vehicle. The complainant became aware of the incident on the morning of 18.02.2026. The complainant further stated that he had previously received multiple threatening calls and messages from certain individuals claiming to be associated with Punjab based gangsters and suspected that the incident may be connected to those threats. During the course of investigation, a suspicious phone number was zeroed in, pursuant to which one Rishav was arrested. He suffered a disclosure statement naming few other persons including the present petitioner and stated that all these persons had conspired to carry out the gun-shot firing with an intention to kill the complainant and to extract money for extortion. He also stated that Rishav and Sukhmanpreet Singh had gone to Madhya Pradesh and had collected four pistols. He further disclosed that a sum of Rs.3,20,000/- had been given to them by one Mandeep Singh for the said purpose. He gave certain other details of the incident as well. The petitioner was arrested on 09.03.2026 and is in custody since then.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the name of the petitioner surfaced in the disclosure statement of co-accused Rishav and that even in his statement, there is no disclosure that the petitioner was present at the time of the incident and the allegation is that he along with other co-accused had conspired to commit the crime. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is in custody since 09.03.2026; final report stands submitted; trial will still take a sufficiently long time and no useful

purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the bail application stating that the allegations are very serious and that other cases are registered against the petitioner.

6. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

7. Concededly, the petitioner, even as per the disclosure statement of co-accused Rishav, was not there at the time of the incident. No recovery has been made from the petitioner. He is suffering incarceration for the last almost four months. Trial will take a sufficiently long time and, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody any longer.

8. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate.

July 02, 2026
Yag Dutt

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

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