



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

126

CRM-M-66124-2025
Date of decision: 19.03.2026

ANSHUMAN ALIAS ANSHUMAN TIWARIPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Vinod Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate and
Mr. Sukrit Chadha, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 162 dated 07.07.2025, registered under Section(s) 103, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Section 111, 309(4), 249, 61(2) of BNS added later on) at Police Station City-1 Abohar, District Fazilka.
2. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that in a long chain of events and disclosures, the name of the petitioner cropped up in a disclosure statement of co-accused-Pawan who had allegedly contacted the petitioner-Anshuman @ Anshuman Tiwari and

one Pranjal Sharma, who supplied the mobile to the assailants on call of one Vishnu, after they had already committed the offence. He contends that the said mobile phone had been sold on 08.07.2025 whereas the incident in question took place on 07.07.2025. The petitioner has thus been nominated as an accused alongwith co-accused Pranjal Sharma, who is also alleged to have given the second mobile to the other accused. He submits that the said Pranjal Sharma, whose role would be identical to the petitioner has already been granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 26.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-65729 of 2025. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 15.07.2025 and the case is still fixed for appearance of the accused on 30.03.2026 and charge is yet to be framed. There are 44 witnesses to be examined in the present case and none has been examined so far.

3. Learned State Counsel is not a position to distinguish the role of the petitioner from that of co-accused Pranjal Sharma except for the fact that the amount towards the price of the mobile phone had been received in the SBI account of the petitioner herein. The said distinction cannot be said to be material so far as the attribution of the petitioner's role is concerned.

4. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

5. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration that the role of the petitioner would be at par with Pranjal Sharma, the petitioner is entitled to bail on the ground of parity. I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MARCH 19, 2026

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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