



238(2)

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

CRM-M-50715-2024

Date of Decision:17.07.2025

PARAMJIT SINGH @ PAMMA

...PETITIONER

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, Deputy, A.G., Punjab.

Mr. J.S. Bains, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 BNSS with a prayer to grant regular bail to him in case FIR No.37 dated 18.02.2024, registered under Sections 365, 120-B and 302, 201 of IPC 1860, Police Station Jandiala, Amritsar Rural, District Amritsar.

2. The FIR in the present case was registered on the basis of the statement made by Sukha Singh son of Gokha Singh and the same has been reproduced below:-

"Statement of Sukha Singh son of Gokha Singh resident of Navi Abadi Ward No.7, P.S. Jandiala aged about 50 years. mobile No. 98556 62940. It is stated that I am resident of the above address and do the to work of agriculture. I have three children out of which eldest is my daughter Rekha wife of Hardeep Singh



resident of Ladowal, Ludhiana, younger to her is my son Akashdeep (20 years), younger to him is my son Vishal Singh (18 years). My son Akashdeep is working at Satguru Collection Balmiki Gate, Jandiala. On 16.2.2024 my son had gone to work like every day and used to return home at about 9.30/10.00 p.m. at night. On that night, my son did not return home, like every day, on which I called my son Akashdeep Singh on his number 86998 79232 and the phone was switched off. We thought that our son has gone with friends or has gone to pay respects at some religious place. On the next day also i.e. on 17.2.2024 the phone of my son Akashdeep was switched off and we were suspicious that something is wrong. At our own level, we saw the CCTV cameras installed in our neighbouring houses and saw that in the CCTV footage, that on 16.2.2024 at about 7.00/7.30 p.m. in the evening, Guramrit Singh alias Amti, son of Manjit Singh alias Manga, son of Buta Singh resident of House No. 4577, Jaian Hospital Road, New Abadi Jandiala had taken our son on some pretext by making him sit behind his Activa No. PB-10-0813 colour white, who has not returned till now. We called on the telephone number of our son and on the number of Guramrit Singh alias Amti aforesaid, number times, but both numbers were switched off. Till now, we kept trying to get information at our own level and now we have come to know that our son Akashdeep Singh was kidnapped by Guramrit Singh alias Amti son of Manjit Singh Manga, son of Buta Singh resident of House No. 4577, Jaian Hospital Road, New Abadi, Jandiala under conspiracy by making him sit behind his Activa on the asking of Raja Takkar son of Kashmir Singh alias Seera Takkar, resident of 7 Ward, Jandiala, near Jaian Government Hospital, Jandiala. The reason for the grudge is that the real sister of Raja Takkar i.e. Aarti, who is major and the son of my brother Balwinder Singh i.e. Malkeet Singh alias Tindi, who is also major, that Aarti and Malkeet Singh with their own get consent had gone from the house to get married. The marriage of



Aarti aforesaid had been fixed by the family of Raja Takkar aforesaid with some other boy. Raja Takkar was suspicious that our son Akashdeep had helped the son of my brother Balwinder Singh i.e. Malkeet Singh alias Tindi and his sister Aarti, in taking from the house and getting married, which is false. Now, we have suspicion that the scooty on which Guramrit Singh alias Amti has kidnapped our son by stating falsehood, the scooty belongs to Deepak alias Daddy Gudda son of Balwinder Singh resident of 7 Ward, Jandiala. All of them in connivance with each other have kidnapped my son Akashdeep aforesaid. Legal action be taken against all of them for kidnapping my son Akashdeep Singh. In this connection I along with my wife Nirmal Kaur were coming to give information to you that you met us on the way. I have got my statement recorded. I have heard it. It is correct. Sd/- Sukha Singh”.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was not named in the FIR nor his physical description was mentioned by the complainant. Learned counsel further contends that during the course of investigation, the dead body of Akashdeep was recovered on 22.02.2024. On the said day, the supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded and he stated that on checking the CCTV camera outside Satguru Collection Shop, he had seen that Akashdeep was taken away by Guramrit Singh @ Amti. Even after checking the CCTV footage, it was found that Raja Takkar, Guramrit Singh @ Amti, Deepak @ Daddi Gunda @ Sukhmandeep Singh, Nishan Singh and Shiva were keeping *datars* in Innova vehicle and had taken away his son in the said vehicle. Even as per the second CCTV footage also, the petitioner was not travelling in the offending vehicle. He further contends that the petitioner was neither present at the spot nor had participated in the occurrence in any manner. Even no weapon was recovered from him and he was wrongly arrested



by the police on 22.02.2024. Learned counsel further submits that out of total 20 witnesses, no witness has been examined so far.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is involved in a serious crime and even the testimony of the complainant is yet to be recorded by the trial Court. Thus, the petition deserves to be dismissed by this Court.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

6. In the present case, the prosecution has relied upon 02 CCTV footages and the petitioner was not seen in any of the CCTV footage. Moreover, the petitioner is in custody for the last about 01 year and 05 months and the prosecution has not been able to examine even a single witness so far. Moreover, the co-accused, Surjit and Mamta have already been granted the concession of bail by the trial Court on 08.05.2024. The prosecution has not been able to place on record to any material to indicate that the petitioner is in a position to influence the witnesses in any manner. Thus, the further custody of the petitioner will not serve any useful purpose.

7. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

17.07.2025
vipin

(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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