



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211-2

CRM-M-688-2025
Decided on : 12.02.2026

Sharanjeet Singh @ Sunny . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Nitesh Singhi, Advocate (through V.C.)
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sharanjeet Singh @ Sunny	46	21.04.2024	25(7), 25(8) of Arms Act, 1959	Lalru	SAS Nagar Mohali

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the name of the petitioner was neither mentioned in the FIR nor was he arrested from the spot. His name surfaced only through the disclosure statement of one of the co-accused, namely, Ajaypal Singh, who has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 30.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-43337-2024, titled as “Ajaypal Singh v. State of Punjab”. Pursuant thereto, petitioner was arrested and six pistols along with 20 live cartridges were allegedly recovered from his possession. He is in custody since 15.05.2024, i.e., for a period of 01 year, 08 months and 28 days.

Copy of the order dated 30.07.2025, produced by learned counsel for the petitioner is taken on record.

3. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner has no direct connection with the other co-accused, who are categorized as ‘A-Category’



gangsters. The culpability of the petitioner is yet to be established during trial. It is also submitted that out of total 16 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far. Though petitioner is involved in two other cases of similar nature, he is on bail in the said cases. Thus, on the ground of parity, as well as the aforesaid factual circumstances, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel, while producing the custody certificate dated 11.02.2026, vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the petitioner is a member of an Organized Crime Syndicate. It is contended that six pistols along with 20 live cartridges have been recovered from his possession, which indicates serious criminal involvement. It is further submitted that petitioner is involved in two other cases of similar nature, though he is on bail therein. Learned State counsel argues that considering the gravity of the offence and the antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve the concession of regular bail. However, it is fairly conceded that only 02 out of 16 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is inside jail for a period of about 01 year, 08 months and 28 days. The name of the petitioner surfaced on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Ajaypal Singh, who has already been granted regular bail. The recovery of arms and ammunition has been affected from the petitioner and the evidentiary value thereof shall be examined during trial.

6. In the given circumstances, particularly keeping in view the prolonged period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, the slow pace of trial, and the fact that similarly situated co-accused Ajaypal Singh has already been enlarged on bail, this Court finds merit in the plea of parity raised by the petitioner. Without commenting on the merits of the case, and considering that further incarceration for an indefinite period would not serve any useful purpose, the prayer for grant of regular bail deserves consideration.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing



bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

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

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

9. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 12, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*