



CRM-M-16166-2025

-1-

**117+224 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-16166-2025 (O&M)**

Date of Decision: 04.11.2025

Ramandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ad another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Viren Jain, Advocate and
Ms.Jyoti Negi, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Ms. Simran Gorla, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)CRM-43486-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.10 dated 16.01.2025 under Sections 304, 317(2), 111, 112, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (Section 307 of BNS, 2023 added lateron), registered at Police Station Salem Tabri, Police Commissionerate, District Ludhiana.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Mukesh Sehgal. It was alleged that on 16.01.2025, when he was going from Dana Mandi to Bahadurke Road, then two unknown persons came from behind on motorcycle bearing registration No.Pb-10-DQ-6954. The person riding pillion showed him a Daat and forcibly taken away his wallet. The rider of the motorcycle was calling the name of pillion rider as Pawan Kumar and his accomplice, rider of the motorcycle was called as Ramandeep Singh (petitioner). The



petitioner had 1500-1600 rupees in his wallet. It was alleged that both these persons also hid one Activa bearing registration No.PB-10-FM-7743, which was stolen earlier. Both these persons had formed a gang to commit robberies. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. The FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 20.01.2025. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 27.02.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition. During the pendency of the present petition, the petitioner was granted interim bail vide order dated 28.03.2025. However, the same was recalled vide order dated 12.09.2025. Since then the petitioner is behind the bars.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner has been named in the FIR on the basis of presumption and assumption. He submits that earlier the petitioner was granted interim bail by this Court and he did not misuse the same. It is submitted that thereafter, on the direction of this Court, he duly surrendered. It is submitted that the complainant has been examined before the trial Court and there are material contradictions made by the complainant during his deposition. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal



antecedents and thus, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner was duly identified by the complainant. On instructions, she submits that the complainant has been examined before the trial Court and out of total 10 prosecution witness, only complainant has been examined, who has supported the case of the prosecution. She has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested on 20.01.2025. Though the petitioner was granted interim bail by this Court, however, to facilitate the examination of the complainant, he was directed to surrender. Now the complainant already stands examined. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 03 months & 29 days as on 03.11.2025. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is

ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)	
	JUDGE	
04.11.2025	Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
sharmila	Whether Reportable :	Yes/No