



218

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

CRM-M-15393-2025

Date of Decision:16.05.2025

SURJIT KUMAR @ PAKHI

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Rhythem Bajaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, Deputy, A.G., 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.145 dated 21.12.2023, registered under Sections 487, 420 IPC, 1860 (Section 120-B IPC, 1860, added later on), Police Station Division 3, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been nominated later on, simply because of the fact that he happens to be acquaintance of Ajay Kumar, co-accused. However, the petitioner had no relation with Ajay Kumar. Even the prosecution had alleged that Pinki was using the identity of other persons, for issuance of the sim card illegally, in connivance with Ajay Kumar and Ajay Kumar had



received a sum of Rs. 49,300/- from Parmanand Patel, co accused. He further submits that Parmanand Patel, Ajay Kumar and Pinki have been granted the concession of bail by this Court vide order Annexures P-2 and P-3 respectively. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 12.04.2024 and is in custody for the last more than one year and one month. Even the challan has been presented against him and his further custody will not serve any useful purpose.

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 carefully.

5. In the present case, other similarly placed co-accused Parmanand Patel, Ajay Kumar and Pinki have been granted the concession of bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody for the last one year and one month and there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

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.

16.05.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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