

2026.PHHC.021144



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

231

CRM-M-59279-2025

Date of decision: 11th February, 2026

Rohit Victor @ Vicky

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vishal Malik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 128 dated 22.06.2021 registered under Sections 307, 427, 336, 341, 506, 120-B and 34 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Canal Colony, District Bathinda.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement got recorded by the complainant Kulveer Singh @ Veera on 22.06.2021, alleging therein that on the same day, he along with his friends Parminder Singh and Jagsir Singh was going towards his village in his Scorpio vehicle and while on the way, they were intercepted by a car. There were 3-4

2026.PHHC.021144




occupants of the same. They continuously fired 8-9 shots at his car towards the front and rear window panes of his car with an intent to kill them. He identified two of them as Sandeep Singh @ Bhalla and Man Singh. By alleging that some other persons could also be conniving with the assailants, he prayed for taking action.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The statement of eye-witness Parminder Singh was recorded on 22.06.2021, on the basis of which, the accused Amandeep Singh @ Amna and Gagandeep Singh @ Badal were nominated as an additional accused. Accused Gagandeep Singh @ Badal was arrested on 26.07.2021. Subsequently, some other accused persons were also arrested. On 08.06.2022, the above named Parminder Singh got recorded supplementary statement to the effect that on conducting inquiries at his own level, he had come to know that the petitioner had hatched a conspiracy to kill the complainant and had instigated the co-accused to do so. The petitioner was nominated as such. He was in custody in some other case and his presence was secured by issuance of production warrants. He was formally arrested on 13.06.2022. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he was not named in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of statement of eye-witness recorded after about one year of the alleged occurrence. Even in his first statement, the above named Parminder Singh had not taken his name. The allegations against him are totally vague and there is

2026.PHHC.021144



no basis for the plea that he had hatched a conspiracy with the co-accused to eliminate the complainant. Rather he was lodged in custody in some other case at the time of occurrence and therefore, there was no question for his conniving with the co-accused for this purpose. He is in custody for a period of over eleven months. He is not required for further investigation. No one had sustained any injury in the incident. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report and custody certificate have been filed by respondent-State. Learned State counsel has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as by hatching conspiracy with the co-accused, he instigated them to murder the complainant though their attempt proved futile. He is a habitual offender as he is involved in several other cases. There are chances of his intimidating the witnesses, absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner was not named in the FIR and it was only on the basis of second supplementary statement as recorded by the alleged eye-witness after about one year of the occurrence that he was nominated as such. No specific overt act has been attributed to him. It is only on thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced during trial that any conclusion as to petitioner's hatching any conspiracy with the co-accused, can be drawn and

2026.PHHC.021144



not at this stage. Moreso, he was in custody at the time of occurrence. Taking into consideration the above discussed facts, but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner has made out a case for release on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed, and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. Since the main petition has been disposed of, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

11th February, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |