



CRM-M-49391-2025

-1-

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

222**CRM-M-49391-2025****Date of Decision: 29.01.2026**

Tarsem Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

225**CRM-M-54853-2025****Date of Decision: 29.01.2026**

Amarpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

232**CRM-M-62928-2025****Date of Decision: 29.01.2026**

Rajbir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sandu, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-49391-2025.
Mr. J.S. Bains, Advocate, for the
petitioner in CRM-M-54853-2025.
Mr. Karan Choudhary, Advocate for
the petitioner in CRM-M-62928-2025.
Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. By this order, the three above-mentioned petitions are disposed of, both having arisen out of the same FIR.
2. Prayer in the present petitions is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in a case FIR No.166 dated 08.06.2025, registered under Section 111 of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, (Section 109 BNS added lateron), at Police Station Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural.
2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the police party while



CRM-M-49391-2025

-2-

patrolling on 08.06.2026, received a secret information to the effect that Tarsem Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-49391-2025), Amarpreet Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-54853-2025) and Rajbir Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-62928-2025) have formed a gang and they are involved in smuggling illegal arms and ammunitions by bringing the same from across the border and supply in Amritsar and other different cities of Punjab. It was informed that in case of raid, they could be arrested alongwith the arms and ammunitions. On receiving the information, raiding party reached at the place disclosed and the car as disclosed was found parked. Three persons were sitting in the same and they were apprehended. On asking, the driver of the car disclosed his name as Tarsem Singh, the person sitting on conductor seat disclosed his name as Amarpreet Singh and the person sitting rear seat of the car, disclosed his name as Rajbir Singh. Their search was conducted and on conducting search, one pistol (9mm), two live cartridges, Rs.50,000/- and one mobile phone, were recovered from Tarsem Singh; Rs.20,000/- and one mobile phone were recovered from Amarpreet Singh and from Rajbir Singh one 30 bore pistol and a magazine were recovered. They failed to produce any licence regarding conscious possession of the same and thus, on the registration of the FIR, they were arrested on the spot. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioners were arrested on 08.06.2025. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail applications filed by the petitioners vide order dated 12.08.2025 and



CRM-M-49391-2025

-3-

14.07.2025, respectively. Earlier petitioner Amarpreet Singh approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-40709-2025, however, which was dismissed as withdrawn. Hence, petitioners Tarsem Singh and Rajbir Singh, have approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petitions, whereas, petitioner Amarpreet Singh approached this Court by way of filing second petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the alleged recovery was effected from a public place, however, no independent witness joined.

It is submitted submitted by learned counsel for Tarsem Singh that the petitioner was falsely implicated in other case and he was granted bail in the same in April, 2025 and just in order to frustrate the bail having been granted to him, he has been falsely implicated in the present case, which is based on the cock and bull story. He submits that the alleged recoveries shown from the petitioner have been planted on him.

Learned counsel for Amarpreet Singh and Rajbir Singh have submitted that the petitioners have no criminal antecedents as they have never been involved in any other case except the present case.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners are behind the bars since the date of their arrest, however, there is no material progress in the trial. They have, thus, submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioners deserve to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the



CRM-M-49391-2025

-4-

submissions made by counsel for the parties. It is submitted that the petitioners are specifically named in the secret information and on receiving the same, raiding team reached the place and the petitioners were arrested alongwith illegal arms. On the disclosure statement of petitioner Tarsem Singh, he was taken for recovery of another weapon on 09.06.2025, however, he fired at the police party itself and thus, Section 109 BNS was also added. He submits that accused Tarsem Singh is a habitual offender, who is involved in number of cases. He has placed on record the custody certificates of the petitioners.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR in the present case was lodged on basis of secret information. The petitioners were arrested on the spot i.e. on 08.06.2025. It is submitted that Tarsem Singh was granted bail in another FIR in April, 2025 and the present FIR was registered two months thereafter on 08.06.2025. The custody certificate of petitioner Tarsem Singh would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 07 months & 15 days as on 28.01.2026, though he is involved in other 15 cases, however, he is on bail in the same. The custody certificates of petitioners Amarpreet Singh and Rabir Singh would show that the petitioners have suffered incarceration of 07 months & 17 days as on 28.01.2026 and they have no criminal antecedents.

6. 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. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. 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 petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

7. 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.

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

29.01.2026

sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No