



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

(I)	CRM-M-5076-2024 (O&M)
Amarjeet Singh @ Rohit	... Petitioner
Versus	
State of Punjab	... Respondent
(II)	CRM-M-8206-2024 (O&M)
Komaljeet Singh @ Bugna	... Petitioner
Versus	
State of Punjab	... Respondent
(III)	CRM-M-11005-2024 (O&M)
Manyog Singh	... Petitioner
Versus	
State of Punjab	... Respondent
(IV)	CRM-M-7550-2024 (O&M)
Paramjit Singh @ Sama	... Petitioner
Versus	
State of Punjab	... Respondent

Date of Decision:-29.8.2024



CRM-M-5076-2024 (O&M)
CRM-M-8206-2024 (O&M)
CRM-M-11005-2024 (O&M) &
CRM-M-7550-2024 (O&M) (2)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. C.S. Jattana, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-5076-2024.

Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-11005-2024.

Mr. Sumeet S. Brar, Advocate and
Mr. Charnjit Singh Bahia, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-8206-2024.

Mr. Amardeep Singh Mann, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CRM-M-7550-2024.

Mr. Inderjeet Singh Ladher, DAG, Punjab.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
114	9.8.2023	City-I, Mansa	307, 379-B, 323, 324, 148, 149 of Indian Penal Code wherein offence under Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act added later on.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

CRM-33346-2024 in CRM-M-7550-2024

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the document annexed with the application is taken on record as Annexure P-4 subject to all just exceptions.

CRM-34367-2024 in CRM-M-11005-2024

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the statement of complainant/PW3 - Bittu Singh annexed with the application is taken on record as Annexure P-7 subject to all just exceptions.



CRM-M-5076-2024 (O&M)
CRM-M-8206-2024 (O&M)
CRM-M-11005-2024 (O&M) &
CRM-M-7550-2024 (O&M)

(3)

CRM-M-5076-2024 (O&M); CRM-M-8206-2024 (O&M);
CRM-M-11005-2024 (O&M) & CRM-M-7550-2024 (O&M) (Main cases)

1. This order shall dispose of the aforesaid four petitions filed on behalf of petitioners Amarjeet Singh @ Rohit, Komaljeet Singh @ Bugna, Manyog Singh and Paramjit Singh @ Sama seeking grant of regular bail in respect of aforementioned FIR.
2. The allegations, in nutshell, are that Rupinder Singh and Paramjit Singh alongwith four unidentified persons had tried to abduct the son of the complainant. It is alleged that the aforesaid persons gave beatings to the complainant and had inflicted injuries to him. It is alleged that the accused had snatched his gold chain weighing two *tolas* and the incident has been captured in the CCTV camera. On 12.8.2023, the complainant made supplementary statement disclosing the names of other persons, whose names were not known at the time of lodging of FIR.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case and as a matter of fact the petitioners Amarjeet Singh @ Rohit, Komaljeet Singh @ Bugna and Manyog Singh are not even named in the FIR. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the falsity of the case would be evident from the fact when the complainant Bittu Singh was examined before the trial Court, he absolutely resiled from his statement and did not support the case of prosecution inasmuch as he did not identify the petitioners to be the assailants.
4. Opposing the petitions, learned State counsel submitted that having regard to the chequered record of the petitioners, who are involved in several other



CRM-M-5076-2024 (O&M)
CRM-M-8206-2024 (O&M)
CRM-M-11005-2024 (O&M) &
CRM-M-7550-2024 (O&M)

(4)

cases, it is quite evident that they have been able to intimidate the complainant and, as such, they do not deserve the concession of bail. Learned State counsel has, however, informed that as on date the petitioners have been behind bars since the last more than 1 year and as on date 2 PWs out of cited 15 PWs have been examined. Learned State counsel has not disputed the fact that the complainant Bittu Singh has already resiled from his statement.

- 5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
- 6. Having regard to the fact that the petitioners have been behind bars for a substantial period of more than 1 year and also that the complainant has not supported the case of prosecution, when he stepped into the witness box, further detention of the petitioners would not be justified.
- 7. All the four petitions, as such, are accepted and the petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.
- 8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of each connected case.

29.8.2024
Geeta

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

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