



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

219

CRM-M-31073-2025
Decided on : 10.09.2025

Sumandeep Singh alias Simma

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Vikas Gutpa, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant second 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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sumandeep Singh alias Simma	229	03.09.2024	62, 351, 308(5) & 317(2) of BNS, 2023 [S. 309(4), 61(2) of BNS, added later on] and 25, 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 [S. 27 of the Arms Act, deleted later on]	Jandiala	Amritsar Rural

2. As per allegations, accused persons had made several calls for extortion and ultimately, Rs.3,00,000/- were snatched from the complainant by two young men while they were on their motorcycle. In the FIR, names of the accused have also been explained as, (i) Gurinder Singh s/o Gurmeet Singh, r/o village Nangal Guru, his nephew, (ii) Paramjit Singh (from whom the shop was taken on rental basis), and other associates, such as; (iii)



Manpreet Singh @ Preet s/o Iqbal Singh, (iv) Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi s/o Rajpal Singh, residents of Jalalabad, (v) Simranjit Singh @ Sima (petitioner herein) s/o Jagtar Singh, r/o Bodal Kheri, and (vi) Ramandeep Singh @ Rama s/o Sahib, r/o Bisamberpura, P.S. Chatiwind.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that since the allegations are almost similar and dispute appears to be amongst the known persons, the story framed by the complainant seems to be concocted one.

He further refers to Annexures P-2 to P-4 appended with the present regular bail petition and submits that almost similarly situated co-accused have been granted concession of anticipatory bail(s)/regular bail(s) by the Coordinate Benches of this Court. The details of which are as under: -

- (i) Ramandeep Singh, granted concession of anticipatory bail vide order dated 29.11.2024, passed in CRM-M-59701-2024 (O&M), titled as, “Ramandeep Singh v. State of Punjab” (Annexure P-2).
 - (ii) Gurpreet Singh alias Gopi, granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 20.12.2024, passed in CRM-M-63367-2024 (O&M), titled as, “Gurpreet Singh alias Gopi v. State of Punjab” (Annexure P-3).
 - (iii) Sharanpreet Singh @ Sharan, granted concession of regular bail vide order dated 15.01.2025, passed in CRM-M-482-2025, titled as, “Sharanpreet Singh @ Sharan v. State of Punjab” (Annexure P-4).
4. Besides above, it has also been pointed out that earlier the first bail petition was withdrawn by the petitioner’s counsel after arguing for some time on 15.05.2025, passed in CRM-M-4043-2025 (O&M), titled as, “Sumandeep Singh @ Simma v. State of Punjab” (Annexure P-6), and thereafter, more than four months period has passed, but till date charges



have not been framed. Thus, when the trial Court is not proceeding any further, that too without any fault of the petitioner, he could not be made liable to sit inside jail for any longer period. Therefore, in view of above and claiming parity, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, has not disputed that the petitioner has been in custody since 04.09.2024, and after presentation of challan on 02.12.2024, charges have not yet been framed. However, he vehemently submits that if the petitioner is granted concession of bail, there is every likelihood of him being absconding from the trial and again can indulge in similar kind of activities.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

7. As per the totality of circumstances, the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here-above, it also emerges that the petitioner has already remained in custody for a considerable period, and since the trial is not progressing at the expected pace, his further detention will not serve any fruitful purpose, particularly when similarly placed co-accused have already been granted the concession of bail. Therefore, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

8. 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.

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

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 10, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*