



231

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

**CRM-M-3309-2025
Date of Decision:27.01.2025**

SUNNY @ SUNNY SINGH**...PETITIONER****VS.****STATE OF PUNJAB****...RESPONDENT****Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat**

Present : Mr. Sidhant Bhonsle, Advocate for
Mr. Akhilesh Vyas, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Bajwa, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.0014 dated 26.02.2024, registered under Sections 379-B (2), 34 of IPC, 1860 (Section 411 of IPC added later on), Police Station Majitha Road, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR was got registered by Rajeev Kumar son of Nakul Sharma, who alleged that at about 1.00 a.m. on 26.02.2024, his scooty was snatched by three unknown persons.

One of them had hit him with an iron dattar on his left ear and he fell down. On



falling, he had been given a blow from the reverse side of dattar on his hand and two other accused had caused him injuries with a baseball bats. The petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor there is any averment, which even remotely connects the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, after one month of the registration of the FIR, the petitioner was arrayed as an accused in the present case. He further contends that similarly placed co-accused Sunny @ Sunny Singh has already been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order dated 18.09.2024 (Annexure P-4). The petitioner is in custody for the last more than 10 months and the challan has already been presented against him. He further contends that the petitioner is the first offender and was never involved in any other criminal activity.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. In the present case, after completion of the investigation, challan has already been presented before the Court. The petitioner is in custody for the last more than 10 months and further custody of the petitioner will not serve any meaningful purpose. Moreover, similarly placed co-accused, namely, Sunny @ Sunny Singh has already been admitted to bail by this Court vide order dated 18.09.2024 (Annexure P-4).

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his



furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate, concerned.

27.01.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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