

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

**CRM-M-13933-2022
Date of Decision: 07.04.2022**

Billu Ram

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kirat Singh Sidhu, DAG, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

The petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.207, dated 22.09.2021, under Sections 307, 324 and 395 of the IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Passiana, District Patiala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that in the present case, the petitioner was not named in the FIR, but he has been involved only on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the other co-accused, namely Babbu Khan, Faizal and Ravi Kumar, have already been extended the concession of regular bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court while passing orders in CRM-M-9436-2022, CRM-M-11483-2022 and CRM-M-13714-2022, respectively. Hence, keeping in view the fact that the allegations alleged

against the petitioner and the said co-accused persons are similar in nature, the petitioner may kindly be extended the concession of regular bail on the ground of parity.

Learned State counsel though concedes the factum that the petitioner was involved in the present case only on the basis of supplementary statement of the complainant but submits that the truck in question was recovered from the petitioner. Learned State counsel further concedes the factum that the allegations alleged against the petitioner and the above said co-accused persons, who have already been extended the concession of regular bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, as mentioned hereinbefore, are similar in nature.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

Keeping in view the fact that the petitioner was not named in the FIR, coupled with the fact that the co-accused persons, against whom also similar allegations have been alleged, have already been extended the concession of regular bail by a co-ordinate Bench, the petitioner has made out a case for the grant of regular bail on the ground of parity, especially in view of the fact that learned counsel for the petitioner has undertaken before this Court that in case the petitioner is extended the concession of regular bail, he will maintain good conduct and will not influence the trial or any witnesses in any manner.

In view of the above and without commenting upon the merits of the case, it is directed that the petitioner be released on regular bail, subject to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

However, it is made clear that anything observed herein shall

not be construed to be an expression of any opinion on the merits of the case.

07.04.2022

Apurva

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No