



CRM-M-9625-2025 and
CRM-M-11760-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

CRM-M-9625-2025

Ishmanjeet Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

207

CRM-M-11760-2025

Gurtej Singh

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

Decided on :25.07.2025

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Taranjit Kaur Hundal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, both the aforementioned
petitions are being disposed of together.



**CRM-M-9625-2025 and
CRM-M-11760-2025**

2

2. Present petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.132 dated 30.09.2024, under Sections 109, 324(4) of BNS and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act (Sections 249, 253, 308(4), 351(1), 61(2) were added later on), registered at Police Station PS Machhiwara, Police District Khanna, Ludhiana.

3. As per the case of the prosecution, data collected through social media platforms, namely Instagram and Snapchat, led to the identification and subsequent arrest of the petitioners. During interrogation, the petitioners, who are real brothers, made confessional statements admitting that they had communicated with each other. In their statements, they further admitted of having harboured and assisted the main accused, Jarmanjit Singh @ Jerry, in fleeing and subsequently escaping to Dubai.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, who are real brothers, have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is further submitted that the petitioners have clean antecedents, with no other criminal case registered against them. Learned counsel states that the petitioners have been in custody for the last nine months and nineteen days. It is also submitted that although there are a total of 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined to date. In view of the likely delay in the conclusion of the trial, learned counsel prays for the grant of regular bail

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel, while filing the custody certificates of the petitioners, opposes the prayer and submits



**CRM-M-9625-2025 and
CRM-M-11760-2025**

3

that there are call detail records establishing consistent communication between the petitioners and the main accused, Jarmanjit Singh @ Jerry. It is further submitted that the petitioners actively assisted and harboured the main accused in evading arrest, ultimately facilitating his escape to Dubai. Learned State Counsel argues that the allegations against the petitioners are serious in nature. It is also submitted that releasing the petitioners at this stage may hamper the ongoing investigation and potentially influence key witnesses. Therefore, learned State Counsel prays for the dismissal of the present bail petition .

6. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioners, who are real brothers, have remained in custody for a substantial period of nine months and nineteen days. It is not disputed that out of the total 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far, and the trial is likely to take considerable time. The petitioners are stated to have clean antecedents, with no other criminal case registered against them. Taking into consideration the fact that the trial is likely to be protracted, the liberty of the petitioners cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period. Accordingly, this Court finds merit in the prayer made on behalf of the petitioners for grant of regular bail.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are allowed. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/



**CRM-M-9625-2025 and
CRM-M-11760-2025**

4

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

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioners are found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

11. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of another connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

25.07.2025

Rashmi

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