

2026:PHHC:020037



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

213

CRM-M-60045-2025
Date of Decision: 10.02.2026

LAKHVIR @ LAKHVEER SINGH @ LAKHU

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate for
Mr. Deepinder Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.222 dated 06.09.2025 under Sections 312, 125, 111, 62 and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 and 27/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Canal Colony, District Bathinda.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith the co-accused forcibly entered the shop of the complainant, threatened him at gunpoint and snatched his money.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter has been settled with the complainant and a petition bearing No.CRM-M-3099 of 2026 has been filed by the parties seeking quashing of the impugned FIR on the basis of compromise. In the said petition, the parties have been directed to appear before the trial Court to record their statements qua compromise. Moreover, the petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months. It is further stated that the trial against the petitioner will take a long time to conclude as only two witnesses have been examined till date out of 22 prosecution witnesses.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the present petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are serious. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months.

6. Mr. Nishant Sehgal, Advocate has appeared and filed memo of appearance on behalf of the complainant. He admits the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties.

7. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 05 months and the matter having been compromised between the parties, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

10. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

11. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

FEBRUARY 10, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No