



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

212

CRM-M No.44818 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 17.09.2025

Simranjit Singh @ Honey

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sarthak Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kamal Narula, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

1. This is first petition, filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of bail. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 191(3) and 190 of BNS, FIR No.87 dated 25.06.2025, has been lodged in Police Station Kulgarhi, District Ferozepur. In the above mentioned FIR later on Section 67 of IT Act has been added. The petitioner is being prosecuted for the commission of above mentioned offence and he has been arrested. The petitioner is still in custody and, therefore, craving for the benefit of bail.

2. In nutshell, the facts emerging from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the statement of complainant Vishal, who stated that on 21.06.2025 at about 2.00 P.M. when he was going to his village Nava Purab from village Nurpur Setha, on the way, he was intercepted by Simranjit



Singh @ Honey, Mani, Vishal, Tony and Karan. According to complainant they all surrounded him and threw chilli powder in his eyes and thereafter took him to secluded location where he was assaulted by them. According to prosecution in view of above mentioned statement of complainant formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation, it came to the knowledge of Investigating Officer that in addition to thrashing of complainant the accused had prepared a video of the incident and circulated it. Thus Section 67 of I.T Act has been added later on.

3. Heard.

4. It has been contented by learned counsel or the petitioner that the petitioner is in custody since 27.06.2025 and that offence is triable by the Magistrate and nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, and, therefore, the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the petitioner has criminal history and that in the past also he has been prosecuted for several offences. According to learned counsel for the complainant more than 8 FIRs have been lodged against the petitioner. As per learned State counsel there is a constant threat by the assailants, to the complainant, and, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for the bail.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. A perusal of record for the decision of present bail petition, following are the factors which are relevant to be taken into consideration: -



- (1) that the offence is triable by Magistrate and the maximum punishment prescribed for offence under Section 67 of I.T. Act, is imprisonment upto 5 years;
- (2) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;
- (3) that investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- (4) that detaining of petitioner in the judicial lock up is not likely to serve any purpose.

8. If cumulative effect of all the above mentioned factors is taken into consideration it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail.

9. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

17.09.2025

Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No