



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

235

CRM-M-31319-2025
Date of decision: 01.08.2025

KARANJIT SINGH @ KARANJEET SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

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

Present:- Mr. Chandan Singh Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)**CRM-23417-2025**

Allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

Main case

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking regular bail in case FIR No.123 dated 13.06.2024 under Sections 379-B(2), 34 of IPC registered at Police Station Division 8, District Jalandhar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that an FIR was registered against 04 persons who armed with *datar*, pistol and baseball bat and snatched Rs.10,000/- from drawer and Rs.17,000/- from the purse of the employee alongwith laptop and mobile phone. Later on, in his supplementary statement recorded, Rs.18,000/- was also stated to be snatched by the accused persons and 02 mobile phones from the workers. The complainant gave the statement that the



petitioner's father disclosed the name of the petitioner who robbed the shop. The police arrested the petitioner on whose disclosure other co-accused namely Prince and Bittu Singh were arrested.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is in custody since 17.06.2024 and has undergone custody period of more than 01 year and 01 month and out of 40 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, 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 and further states that the petitioner has undergone custody period of 01 year, 01 month and 14 days and does not refute the fact that out of 40 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far.

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

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is 01 year, 01 month and 14 days and also the fact that out of 40 prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far and also conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, therefore further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. This Court deems it fit 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.

01st August

Sonia Puri

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(H.S. GREWAL)

JUDGE