

CRM-M-72924-2025
CRM-M-72977-2025
CRM-M-336-2026
CRM-M-718-2026

1

2026.PHHC.049205



137(2 cases)+205+206 (04 cases)

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

1. CRM-M-72924-2025

Yuvraj Singh @ Sahil GianiPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

2. CRM-M-72977-2025

Sanju @ Sanju RandhawaPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

3. CRM-M-336-2026

Yuvraj Singh @ YuviPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

4. CRM-M-718-2026

Abhi Gill @ Abhijit GillPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

Date of decision : 30.03.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. G.S. Minhas, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M No.72924 of 2025.



Mr. Ripudaman Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M No.72977of 2025 (through V.C.).

Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-336-2026.

Ms. Gursharan K. Mann, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Anmol Jeeva S. Gill, Advocate; Ms. Shruti, Advocate;
Mr. Arshjot S. Mohi, Advocate and
Mr. Armandeep K., Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-718-2026.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, D.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of abovesaid four petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.
2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.43 dated 15.03.2024, under Sections 302, 120-B, 148 & 149 of IPC and Sections 25-27-54-59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Gate Hakima, District Amritsar.
3. Succinctly, the facts of the present case are that the FIR in question had been registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Kiran Sethi. It was alleged that the Complainant is having two sons, namely, Sahil, who has been adopted by her mother Asha Rani and younger son Rajbveer Sethi @ Veenu, aged about 30 years, who was pursuing Hotel Management Course. It was alleged that on 15.03.2024, at about 6:30 p.m., his son Rajbveer Sethi alias Veenu had gone in his car for a drive and at about 10:30 p.m., when complainant was present in the house, someone knocked at the door and told her that her son Veenu was shot by Paras Randhawa, Nikhil Bholu, Sahil Randhawa and 10/12 unidentified persons who were on 4/5 motorcycles at Gate Hakima



Chowk, Amritsar and her son was taken to Amandeep Hospital, Amritsar. It was further alleged that when the complainant went to the said Hospital, she came to know that her son had died due to receiving firearm injury. Thus, request was made to take legal action against all the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During investigation, on the disclosure statement made by eye-witness, namely, Harjit Singh, the petitioners were arrayed as accused and resultantly, were arrested on 28.09.2024, 18.03.2024, 05.10.2024 and 18.03.2024, respectively. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioners-Yuvraj Singh @ Sahil Giani (in CRM-M-72924-2025), Sanju @ Sanju Radhawa (in CRM-M-72977-2025), Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi (in CRM-M-336-2026) and Abhi Gill @ Abhijit Gill (in CRM-M-718-2026) approached the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, their applications were declined after hearing both the sides by Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar vide orders dated 04.04.2025, 11.07.2024, 08.09.2025 and 06.08.2024, respectively. Aggrieved by the same, petitioners-Yuvraj Singh @ Sahil Giani, Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi and Abhi Gill @ Abhijit Gill, earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-50514-2025, CRM-M-56298-2025 and CRM-M-65231-2024, but the same were dismissed on 17.09.2025, 14.10.2025 and 26.08.2025, respectively. Hence, they are before this Court by way of present second petitions. However, petitioner-Sanju @ Sanju Randhawa, approached this Court twice by way of filing of CRM-M-37281-2024 and CRM-M-26067-2025 but the same were also dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide orders dated 08.08.2024 and



26.08.2025, respectively. Hence, he is before this Court by way of filing of present third petition, for grant of bail.

4. Learned Senior counsel and other counsels for the petitioners have contended that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the alleged occurrence had taken place on 15.03.2024 and the FIR was registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Kiran Sethi. It is contended that the petitioners were neither named in the FIR nor they were attributed any role. It is submitted that there were general allegations made against assailants, namely, Paras Randhawa, Nikhil Bholu and Sahil Randhawa accompanied by 10-12 unknown persons. It is contended that hereinafter, statement of one alleged eye-witness, namely, Harjit Singh, was recorded, wherein the petitioners were arrayed as accused without any rhyme and reasons. It is submitted that alleged eye-witness, namely, Harjit Singh had appeared before the trial Court as PW-1 wherein, he deposed that he had identified accused, namely, Sahilpreet Singh @ Sohi, Nikhil Bholu, Paras, Panjab Singh, Goldy, Sahil Giani, Kullah, Rajwinder Singh and Bunty and he, thus, makes a material contradiction from his earlier statement while deposing before the trial Court. It is submitted that the petitioners except Sahil Giani were not even identified by this alleged eye-witness. It is contended that as per the postmortem report, there is only firearm injury to the deceased which has been alleged to co-accused Sahilpreet Singh. It is submitted that though the petitioners are involved in other cases as well, however, they all are on bail in those cases. It is thus, contended that the material witness relied upon by the prosecution is eye-witness Harjit Singh, who has not supported the case of the prosecution *qua* the



petitioners except petitioner-Sahil Giani.

5. It is submitted by counsel for petitioner-Sahil Giani, that name of the petitioner has been arrayed as an accused as an afterthought, on the basis of a statement recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. after 02 days of the occurrence.

6. It is thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the case, petitioners deserve to be granted bail.

7. Learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioners and submits that the petitioners along with the co-accused have formed the unlawful assembly. He submits that all of them in a pre-meditated manner had fired shots at the deceased. He submits that the eye-witness had identified the assailants. He further submits that the case of the prosecution is supported by the other evidences beside the eye-witness evidence. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 27 prosecution witnesses only 01 witness i.e. eye-witness, Harjit Singh, has been examined. He has produced the custody certificates of the petitioners on record.

8. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the FIR was registered on the statement of complainant, Kiran Sethi. The petitioners, at the initial stage, have not been named in the FIR, however, 02 days thereafter when the statement of eye-witness Harjit Singh was recorded, who was examined before the trial Court as PW-1, they have been arrayed as accused in the present case. As per his deposition, except petitioner-Sahil Giani, he has not identified any other accused which includes the petitioners. The petitioners are behind bars since the dates of their arrest. Out of 27 prosecution witnesses, only 01



witness has been examined. As per custody certificates, petitioners-Yuvraj Singh @ Sahil Singh and Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi, have suffered an incarceration of more than 01 year and petitioners-Sanju Randhawa and Abhi Gill @ Abhijit Gill, have suffered an incarceration of more than 02 years. It further reflects that though petitioners are involved in other cases as well, however, they are on bail in those cases, except petitioner-Abhi Gill @ Abhijit Gill.

9. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

10. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, all the petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by petitioner-Abhi Gill @ Abhijit Gill (in CRM-M-718-2026). during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

30.03.2026

ps-I

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No