



CRM-M-35886-2025

1

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

231

CRM-M-35886-2025
Decided on :16.09.2025

Prabhdeep Singh alias Judge

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rahil Mehra, Advocate for the petitioner .

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.107 dated 22.12.2024, under Sections 308(4), 351(2), 109, 3(5), 61(2), 132, 221 of BNS and Sections 25/27/29 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Chohla Sahib, Tarn Taran.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the version put forth by the complainant in the FIR is grossly delayed, as the alleged threat call that gave rise to the occurrence is stated to have taken place on 18.12.2024, whereas the FIR was registered only on 22.12.2024. It is further submitted that the petitioner has not been attributed any overt act, and the case is one of no injury. No specific role has been assigned to the petitioner in the initial version.

**CRM-M-35886-2025****2**

Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner has been implicated solely on the basis of a supplementary statement made by the complainant on 25.12.2024, which is based on alleged secret information.

It is also submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 25.12.2024, and the challan has already been presented before the competent court. Learned counsel further submits that similarly placed co-accused, namely Kuldeep Singh @ Laddu, has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 11.09.2025, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran. Therefore, on the ground of parity, petitioner also prays for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned State Counsel, while opposing the prayer for grant of bail, submits that petitioner, along with his associates, allegedly opened fire at the complainant's house with the intent to threaten and extort money from the complainant. It is contended that such an act not only endangered the lives of innocent persons but also created a sense of fear and insecurity in the locality. Learned State Counsel further submits that the allegations against the petitioner are of a serious nature and that his release at this stage may adversely affect the ongoing investigation and trial. Therefore, he prays for the dismissal of the present bail application.

4. In view of the above, and considering the fact that petitioner is in custody since 25.12.2024, the challan has already been presented, and no specific or overt act has been attributed to him in the initial version of the FIR, coupled with the fact that the case is one of no injury

**CRM-M-35886-2025****3**

and the implication of the petitioner is based on a delayed supplementary statement, this Court is of the opinion that further incarceration of the petitioner may not serve any useful purpose. Moreover, a similarly placed co-accused has already been granted the concession of regular bail. Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, 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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

5. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, 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.

6. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.09.2025*Rashmi*

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*