



249

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

**CRM-M No.44415 of 2025
Date of decision: 21.08.2025**

Rohit Garg

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.123, dated 06.09.2024, under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(1), 351(3), 304, 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act (Sections 109 & 311 BNS added later on), registered at Police Station Kotwali, Nabha, District Patiala, Punjab.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the present case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Yashpal Singh. It was alleged that he is practicing as an Advocate in Nabha Court. On 5.9.2024 at about 11.30 p.m. he was going towards his house from Bouran Gate to Golden City, Nabha in his I-20 Car. When he, after parking his vehicle started walking, then he saw one Maruti Ritz car which is owned by Rohit Rangoli (petitioner). Rohit Rangoli was driving the car and on the



passenger seat, Jeeta son of Mehas was sitting, and Komal, Bikramjit Singh son of Yashpal Singh and one unknown person were sitting on rear seat of the car. It was further alleged that those 5 persons came out of the car. Jeeta was armed with Desi Katta, others were armed with Iron rods and Komal was having Kirch and they gave rod blows on both his legs and arms. Thereafter, Jeeta pointed his country made pistol towards his head and asked him for key of his Brezza Car. Due to the fear, the complainant handed over the keys of his car to Jeeta and the petitioner before leaving from the spot, snatched the complainants' two tolas gold chain, 25 grams Iron Bracelet and two more gold articles. The motive behind the occurrence was the dispute between the complainant and the accused persons with regard to Brezza Car, and the complainant had also moved an application against the accused regarding selling of heroin at Rohti Bridge. Thus, the request was made to take the legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 25.09.2024. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 05.02.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-25045-2025 praying for the grant of bail, however the same was dismissed as not pressed vide order dated 13.05.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present second petition.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been roped falsely and frivolously in the present case. He has submitted that as per the allegations made by the complainant, the dispute is primarily between the co-accused, namely, Bikramjit Singh and the complainant as co-accused, Bikramjit Singh had given his car to the complainant. He has submitted that the allegations pertaining to snatching of jewellery are also not against the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner had been roped in the present case on the basis of the fabricated allegations and he is behind bars since 25.09.2024. He has further submitted that the investigation is already completed and challan has been presented in the present case. He has submitted that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of about 01 year in the present case during the investigation. He has further submitted that the matter has already been compromised between the parties. He has submitted that co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Jagjeet Singh @ Jeeta has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 05.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-25996-2025 and thus, case of the petitioner is at par with that of the co-accused. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State Counsel, has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that name of the petitioner was specifically mentioned in the FIR and he was arrested on 25.09.2024. She has submitted that the investigation is already complete, challan has been presented and the charges have been framed. She, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 28 prosecution witnesses, no



witness has been examined so far. She has endorsed the fact that co-accused has already been granted bail by this Court.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that as per allegations made by the complainant, the dispute was between the complainant and co-accused, Bikramjit Singh. As submitted before this Court, now the dispute has already been resolved between the parties by way of compromise. Co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Jagjeet Singh @ Jeeta has already been granted bail by this Court.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case.

8. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail on parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

21.08.2025

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

: Yes/No
: Yes/No