



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

251

CRM-M-20353-2025
Date of Decision: 25.04.2025

Bikramjit Singh
...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab
...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present:- Mr. P.B.S. Goraya, Advocate,
Mr. S.S. Bhullar, Advocate,
Mr. S.P.S.Sandhu, Advocate and
Mr. Pahul Puneet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

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
Bikramjit Singh	71	13.09.2024	304,Section 3(5), 317(1) of BNS, 2023 added later on 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act	C Division	Amritsar

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the abovementioned FIR. He submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other FIR. The name of the



petitioner is not mentioned in the FIR and he is involved in this case on the basis of a disclosure statement suffered by co-accused. It is further submitted that challan in this case has been filed before the Illaqa Magistrate and conclusion of it will take long time. It is also submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 17.09.2024 and thus, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that vide order dated 20.02.2025, passed in CRM-M-2303-2025 (Annexure P-1), co-accused namely, Shivamdeep Singh, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by noticing his role of snatching the bag of gold from the complainant. The role alleged against the present petitioner is absolutely the same as alleged against the already released co-accused Shivamdeep Singh. Thus, prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

4. On advance notice and in response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 24.04.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

5. As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 07 months and 03 days period inside jail and there is no other case registered against him.

6. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, however, he could not dispute the fact that the similarly situated co-accused, namely Shivamdeep Singh has



been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance, this Court finds substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by observing that since co-accused Shivamdeep Singh, the role alleged against whom is similar to the role attributed to the petitioner, has already been granted the concession of regular bail and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars as the investigation is complete and challan already stands presented, the present petitioner deserves the same concession.

8. 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.

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

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

11. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

12. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly



found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

13. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 25, 2025
nisha

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