



CRM-M-45089-2025

-1-

**221 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-45089-2025

Date of Decision: 29.01.2026

Kuldeep Singh @ Kalu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Malkiat S. Hundal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.106 dated 26.05.2025, registered under Sections 109, 3(5) BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that it came to the notice of the police officials while patrolling on 26.05.2025 that a video of 13.05.2025 that had gone viral on social media in which two unknown persons were seen firing at the gate of the house of Satnam Singh, resident of Mohalla Sheikhpura. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and thus, he was arrested on 26.05.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 18.07.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying

for grant of bail by way of filing the present petition



3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR, nor any overt act has been attributed to him. However, during the investigation, on the supplementary statement made by alleged victim Satnam Singh, the petitioner was arrayed as an accused. It is submitted that the allegations levelled against the petitioners by Satnam Singh, are totally on the basis of assumption and presumptions. To buttress his arguments, he submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case, however, he is behind the bars from the last more than eight months. He submits that there is no material progress in the trial. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was specifically named by victim Satnam Singh in his supplementary statement recorded on 26.05.2026. The victim alleged that on inquiring, he found that the petitioner had carried out *recce* of his house and it is on the information provided by the petitioner, co-accused fired at his house. On instructions, he submits that out of total six prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrayed as an accused in this case on 26.05.2025 on the basis of supplementary statement of victim Satnam Singh.



CRM-M-45089-2025

-3-

It has been submitted by Satnam Singh that he came to know about the involvement of the petitioner on the basis of inquiry conducted by his own. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 08 months as on 27.01.2026. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

7. 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. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

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

29.01.2026

sharmila

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE