



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRM-M-1312-2025
Decided on : 17.01.2025

Pawandeep Singh @ Mantri

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Amandeep S. Samra, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, by the petitioner – Pawandeep Singh @ Mantri, for seeking regular bail, who has been booked for having committed the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023, in case FIR No. 80, dated 06.07.2024, registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, Distt. Tarn Taran, during the pendency of trial.

2. On the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner refers to the order dated 05.12.2024, passed by the coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM-M-45604-2024, in case titled as, “Gurmit Singh v. State of Punjab”, whereby, co-accused Gurmit Singh, facing the similar allegations has been granted concession of regular bail. Copy of the said order is already appended with present petition as Annexure P-1.

3. *Qua* the role of the petitioner, learned counsel further refers to para No.2 of the aforesaid order dated 05.12.2024, and submits that as per



the allegations, petitioners and his other co-accused namely Shamsheer Singh and Gurmit Singh (whom bail has been granted) were issuing armed licences in the concerned office of District Magistrate.

4. Further submits that all the submissions recorded in the said order would be applicable *qua* the present petitioner also, while considering his plea of regular bail. It is also informed that investigation has already been completed and final report u/s 173 Cr.P.C., has been submitted. However, charges are yet to be framed. Thus, process of recording evidence and culmination of trial would take considerable time.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer of the petitioner. However, he does not dispute the factual position addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, as recorded here-above and also the fact that trial in the case is yet to begin, as charges have not been framed so far.

Besides, the learned State counsel also verifies that the petitioner is not involved in any other case of a similar nature.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant record available on the case file.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also the factum of petitioner being inside jail since 06.12.2024 and further custody of the petitioner is not of any use for the prosecution, as also the fact that he is not involved in any other case of similar nature, I deem it appropriate to entertain the petitioner's plea for regular bail.

8. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial



Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 17, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*