



- 1 -

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

217

CRM-M-43560-2025

Date of decision: 27.08.2025

SUNNY SINGH ALIAS SHANI**....Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present : Mr. Gaurav Kalsi, Advocate for
Mr. H.S. Batth, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR. J.(Oral)

1. This is the second petition for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.0006, dated 17.01.2025, under Sections 309(4), 333, 3 and 5 of the BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station Harike, District Tarn Taran.

2. The present FIR was registered on the basis of statement made by complainant Sukhwinder Singh Alias Shindu to the effect that he is working at Simran Medical Store situated at his village Pringri. On 16.01.2025, at about 8:15 p.m., he was present at his shop. Four young persons came in i-20, white colour car and one of them asked him to give medicine for his stomach ache. When he was giving medicine, two more persons came out of the car and entered the shop. They took out their pistols and one of them by pointing the pistol on his forehead, asked him to hand over the money. One of them hit on his forehead with the butt of his pistol, while the other two persons started searching the cash box. They took away his mobile phone and a sum of Rs.8,000/- from his pocket and fled away



- 2-

from the spot. Matter was investigated and petitioner – Sunny Singh @ Shani was arrested on 28.01.2025. Remaining accused have not been arrested as yet and after completion of investigation, final report has been presented for trial of the accused.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated. The offence in question was committed by unknown persons. Even their physical features, age, complexion and built etc. have not been mentioned in the FIR. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argued that no test identification parade has been got conducted by the police during the investigation and nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner, who is custody since 28.01.2025. The trial is likely to take a long time to conclude and as such, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody and he may be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and in case he is released on bail, he will try to won over the witnesses or intimidate them.

6. The co-accused have not been arrested yet and the offence in question was committed by unknown persons, whose physical features i.e. age, complexion and built have not been mentioned in FIR. No test identification parade too has been got conducted. No stolen article has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. Petitioner is in custody since 28.01.2025. The investigation has already been completed *qua* the petitioner and challan has been presented. The



trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude. In these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and he deserves to be released on bail.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

27.08.2025
amandeep

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

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