



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

249

CRM-M-482-2025

Date of decision: 15.01.2025

Sharanpreet Singh @ Sharan

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.229 dated 03.09.2024 under Sections 62, 351, 308(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short, 'BNS') and Sections 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 317(2), 309(4), 61(2) of the BNS added and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 deleted lateron) registered at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner came to be nominated as an accused on the basis of a disclosure statement allegedly suffered by co-accused Gurpreet Singh, who claimed that the petitioner had also participated in the robbery/extortion at gun point. It has been submitted that two co-accused, including one who was named in the FIR in question, had since been extended the concession of bail by a Coordinate Bench of



CRM-M-482-2025

this Court vide orders dated 29.11.2024 and 20.12.2024 (Annexures P-1 and P-2). Learned counsel has further contended that since charges have not yet been framed and as many as 14 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution, the trial would, therefore, take considerable time to conclude and in the circumstances, further incarceration of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, has not disputed that the petitioner has been in custody since 04.09.2024 and after the challan was presented on 02.12.2024, charges have not yet been framed. It has also not been disputed by the learned State counsel that the petitioner was not named in the FIR in question and came to be nominated as an accused in a disclosure statement suffered by co-accused.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record including the allegations levelled in the FIR in question which has been annexed as Annexure P-3.

5. The petitioner has been in custody since 04.09.2024. The trial would take considerable time to conclude as charges have not yet been framed. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed

**CRM-M-482-2025**

to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

15.01.2025

Vinay

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**JUDGE**

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