

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:026641-DB



CRA-D-1468-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-19.02.2026

Pargat Singh

... Appellant

versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI.

Present:- Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Gaganbir Kaur Kahlon, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Adeshwar Singh Pannu, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab.

RAMESH KUMARI, J.

1. Appellant Pargat Singh assails order dated 13.10.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur, vide which the learned Court dismissed the application filed by the appellant seeking regular bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.8, dated 17.02.2025 at Police Station Kotli Surat Mallian, Police District Batala, District Gurdspur, Punjab, under Sections 109 and 324(4), of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS), Sections 3, 4 and 5 of Explosive Act, 1908 & Sections 13, 16, 17, 18, 18(B) and 20 of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act and offences under Section 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita-2023.
2. The translated gist of the FIR lodged on the statement of SI Jasjit Singh reads as follows:

“Today, when I was present at Adda Shikar Machhiyan in search of anti-social persons, a secret informer informed me that today at around 08:10 PM, some unknown motorcyclists dropped some explosive substance at the house of Sukhdev Singh son of Puran Singh, resident of Raimal with an intention of kill him and thereby caused an explosion, which resulted in damage to his house. Since, by doing so these unknown persons have committed offence punishable u/ss 109, 324(4) BNS & Sections 3, 4, 5 of the EXPLOSIVE ACT 1908, intimation is being sent to the Police Station for registration of FIR. Sd/- Jasjit Singh, SI/SHO, P.S. Kotli Surat Malli.”

3. Short reply by way of affidavit of Shri Sumeer Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Detective Batala with the additional charge of Sub Division Dera Baba Nanak, Police District Batala has been filed by learned State counsel today in Court, which is taken on record.
4. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant is nowhere named in the FIR and is sought to be nominated on the basis of a disclosure statement. It has further been submitted that, in any case, the appellant cannot even be connected with any of the ‘call-detail record’ stated to have been collected by the police during the course of investigation.
5. On the other hand, learned State counsel submitted that during the course of investigation, sufficient evidence has been collected to show the complicity of the appellant. Learned State counsel pointed out that co-accused Vishal Bhatti in his disclosure statement specifically disclosed that an amount of Rs.25,000/- was sent by Ranjodh Singh @ Jodha (son of applicant) to Mohit Dhiman in Himachal Pradesh and that said Mohit Dhiman further gave this amount to Vishal Bhatti and that Vishal Bhatti during his disclosure statement nominated the appellant herein. Said Vishal Bhatti in his disclosure statement stated that appellant Pargat Singh gave an amount of Rs.5,000/- to him (Vishal Bhatti).
6. Learned State counsel informed that the appellant Pargat Singh is none-else but father of Ranjodh Singh.

7. We have considered the rival submissions addressed before this Court.
8. The entire case against the appellant is based on disclosure statement of Vishal Bhatti. We have perused the disclosure statement of Vishal Bhatti. Vishal Bhatti in third paragraph of his disclosure statement dated 06.03.2025 stated that he had talked with Ranjodh Singh on '*signal app*' till 24.02.2025 and after that Ranjodh Singh had talked with his father i.e. Pargat Singh (appellant herein) for making payment of Rs.5000/- to him and he was unable to remember the said date of handing over the amount to him and he alleged that the family of Ranjodh Singh i.e. his parents and wife knew about the deeds of Ranjodh Singh.
9. There is no evidence to show that the appellant was ever in touch with any of the co-accused. The evidence collected cannot be said to be sufficient to prima facie hold that the appellant is involved in the alleged occurrence.
10. The appellant is in custody in this case since 08.05.2025. Amandeep Kaur wife of the appellant has already been granted the benefit of pre-arrest bail by this Court vide order dated 16.07.2025 passed in CRA-D-892 of 2025. After presentation of the challan, the prosecution has not examined even a single witness as of today and total period of custody of the appellant is 9 months 10 days.
11. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the instant appeal, as such, is accepted and the appellant is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.

12. Needless to observe that the observations made hereinabove are only for the determination of appeal seeking bail and same shall have no bearing on the merits of the trial pending before the trial Court.
13. Since the case of the appellant is fixed for recording the evidence of the prosecution witnesses, the trial Court is directed to take the following steps for expeditious conclusion of the trial:-

- (i) The trial Court shall frame a schedule of dates in advance for summoning the witnesses and shall also endeavour to record the statements of the PWs whose presence is duly secured. Special Messengers be deputed for securing the presence of the prosecution witnesses. If deemed necessary, a letter may be written to the Senior Superintendent of Police, concerned, for getting the needful done for ensuring timely presence of prosecution witnesses; and
- (ii) The prosecution is directed to ensure the presence of all the prosecution witnesses before the trial Court on the dates as may be fixed by the trial Court for recording prosecution evidence. The District Attorney concerned to take necessary steps for the purpose of securing the presence of the remaining prosecution witnesses.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

19.02.2026
ravinder

Whether speaking/reasoned	√Yes/No
Whether reportable	√Yes/No