



CRM-M-56182-2025 and
CRM-M-64450-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-56182-2025

Ankeerat Singh alias Kerat

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CRM-M-64450-2025

Sarabjeet Singh @ Sabba

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

qwdf

Decided on: 19.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-56182-2025)

Mr. Gobind Singh Randhawa, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CRM-M-64450-2025)

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of this common order, both the above-mentioned petitions are being decided together as they arise out of the same FIR and common allegations.

2. All the above mentioned accused namely–(i) Ankeerat Singh @ Kerat and (ii) Sarabjeet Singh @ Sabba have filed bail petitions under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the



CRM-M-56182-2025 and
CRM-M-64450-2025

petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
56	22.04.2025	25 of Arms Act and Section 111 of BNS	Balachaur	SBS Nagar

3. Separate status reports in both the cases have been filed in the Court today and the same are taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at appropriate place.

4. On the basis of secret information received by patrolling team against Sarabjeet Singh @ Sabha (petitioner in CRM-M-64450-2025) and Ankeerat Singh @ Kerat (petitioner in CRM-M-56182-2025) and (iii) Shammi Kapoor @ Deepa, regarding they being habitual in keeping illegal weapons and then committing crimes in connivance with the local people, FIR in question was registered against all three of them. On being intercepted by the police and by way of separate recovery memo from the possession of petitioner Ankeerat Singh @ Kerat, three live cartridges were shown to have been recovered on 22.04.2025.

From the possession of another accused namely, Sarabjeet Singh @ Sabha, one pistol of .32 caliber was recovered. Similarly from co-accused Harpreet Singh @ Happy, one *datar* was recovered.

5. The common argument addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) qua both the petitioners is that, a false case has been registered against the petitioner(s). Infact, nothing was recovered from their possession. Alleged confessional statements are inadmissible in law. The offence primarily is under the Arms Act and same is triable by the Court of learned Magistrate, thus,



**CRM-M-56182-2025 and
CRM-M-64450-2025**

3

invoking the provision of Section 111 of the BNS is nothing, but an arbitrary exercise by the Punjab Police. The petitioners are inside jail since 22.04.2025 and till date even process of recording of statements of witnesses has not been started.

6. By referring to the details of other cases against the petitioner- Sarabjeet Singh @ Sabba, learned State counsel submits that he is accused in several other cases.

I have considered the said objection, and find it irrelevant the purpose of considering the plea of bail because it appears that the police already had knowledge prior of the accused person, who is facing several other criminal cases. In the present case, recovery was effected on the basis of alleged confessional statement and authenticity of such statement is yet to be determined by the trial Court.

7. Considering all the circumstances and without making any opinion on the merits of the case(s), the present petitions are allowed. Petitioners namely, (i) Ankeerat Singh @ Kerat and (ii) Sarabjeet Singh @ Sabba are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner(s) shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of



CRM-M-56182-2025 and
CRM-M-64450-2025

evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

- 11. Both the petitions stand disposed of.
- 12. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

19.02.2026
reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

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