



CRM-M-21083-2025

-1-

**239**                    **IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA**  
**AT CHANDIGARH**  
**CRM-M-21083-2025**  
Date of Decision: 18.08.2025

Vipan Kumar @ Vipan

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present:     Mr. Anil Kumar Spehia, Advocate, for the petitioner.  
                 Ms. Simran Gorla, AAG, Punjab.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

1.                Present second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.107 dated 01.09.2024, under Sections 204, 332, 305, 308, 351(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Sarabha Nagar, District Ludhiana.

2.                Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Harish Kumar. It was alleged that on 31.08.2024, he had gone to Raikot alongwith his family to meet his parents. Mehboob Ali and his servant Suraj were present at his home. At about 2:30 p.m., Mehboob Ali informed on phone that after the complainant left the house, some unknown persons impersonating themselves as CBI officers, forcibly entered his house by showing pistol and snatched the mobile phone and started giving them beatings and forcibly searched the rooms. Thereafter, these four unknown persons escaped in a Swift car, which was parked outside the house. It was alleged that they had taken three mobile phones with them and cash of Rs.40,000/- was also found missing. It was informed by Mehboob Ali that Tamandeep @ Ginni, earlier servant of the



complainant was one of the accused. Request of was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Complicity of the petitioner was found during the investigation and hence, he was arrested on 01.09.2024. 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 21.10.2024. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-55461-2024, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 13.11.2024. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Sushil Malhotra. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 02.04.2025 passed in **CRM-M-52507-2024**, whereby, co-accused Sushil Malhotra has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 01.09.2024. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Sushil Malhotra. She has



placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 01.09.2024. Co-accused, namely, Sushil Malhotra is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 11 months & 14 days as on 17.08.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, 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 on the basis of parity. 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.

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

18.08.2025  
sharmila

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/Reasoned : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable :        | Yes/No |