



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

218

CRM-M-9640-2025
Decided on : 07.07.2025

JATIN

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Yaseen Sethi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jatin, aged about 31 years	147	04.06.2024	379-B (2), 411, 34 of IPC	Sahnewal	Police Commissionerate Ludhana

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that name of the petitioner does not find mention in the FIR. It is submitted that upon arrest, only a sum of Rs.300/- was recovered from the petitioner. Petitioner is facing incarceration since 06.06.2024. Out of total of ten prosecution witnesses, only one witness has been examined so far.



It is further submitted that co-accused Deepak has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court, vide order dated 14.05.2025, passed in CRM-M-61611-2024, copy of which has been produced in Court and taken on record.

Additionally, another co-accused, namely Ashok Kumar @ Shoki, has also been granted bail by this Court, in CRM-M-56839-2024 (Annexure P-3). Thus, counsel for the petitioner submits that case of the petitioner is not distinguishable from those of the aforementioned co-accused. Therefore, on the ground of parity, petitioner is also entitled to the concession of bail.

3. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that such offences are increasing in the society, especially in the State of Punjab, and no leniency can be applied in the case of petitioner. However, learned State counsel does not dispute the fact that petitioner is of the age of 31 years and is not found to be involved in any other similar activity. All other factual aspects as stated by counsel for the petitioner today before this Court, could not be disputed by learned State counsel.

4. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

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

**CRM-M-9640-2025****3**

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

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

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, 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.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

07.07.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**