



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

235

CRM-M-14745-2025
Date of decision: 10.07.2025

PRITAM SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. R.S. Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 seeking regular bail in FIR No.103 dated 30.11.2024 under Sections 109, 308(4), 111(4), 125, 3(5), 61(2) of BNS and Sections 25/ 54/ 59 of Arms Act, and Sections 25(6) and 25(7) of Arms Act were added later on, registered at Police Station Valtoha, District Tarn Taran.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant namely Baljinder Singh @ Bablu has alleged that he has received a whatsapp voice message on his mobile number from an unknown person of foreign country on 26.11.2024 at about 4.42 pm whereby Rs.20 lakhs were demanded as extortion. However, he did not take the message seriously at that time. On 30.11.2024 at



7.15 am when he was present at his shop, three unidentified persons came in a car and one person fired gunshot with the intention to kill him. Thereafter, they ran away. The complainant could not read the number of the car as its number plate was hidden with mud. An FIR in this regard was registered which was initially against the unknown persons and later on, the petitioner was nominated as an accused on the basis of statement made by Gurbinder Singh, the co-accused.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and later on, on the basis of supplementary statement, the name of the petitioner was added on. He further states that he is in custody for more than 06 months.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail by way of filing of custody certificate dated 08.07.2025 and further states that the petitioner has undergone actual custody period of 06 months and 17 days.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence on the police file qua the present petitioner. Also, no fire arm has been recovered from the possession of present petitioner. Moreover, neither the petitioner was named by the complainant nor was identified by him. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the petitioner is in



custody for the last 06 months and 17 days, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time and as such, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

10th July, 2025

Sonia Puri

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

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