



CRM-M-48741-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-48741-2025

Date of Decision: 05.09.2025

Kamal Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

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

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.123 dated 06.09.2024 under Sections 109, 115(2), 126(2), 351(1), 351(3), 304, 191(3), 190 BNS, Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Kotwali, Nabha, District Patiala.

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 District Courts. On 5.9.2024 at about 11.30 p.m. he was going towards his house from Bauran Gate to Golden City, Nabha in his I-20 Car. When after parking his vehicle, he started walking, then he saw one Maruti Ritz car being driven by Rohit Rangoli and on the passenger seat, Jeeta son of Mehas was sitting and on the rear seat Komal, Bikramjit Singh and one unknown person were sitting. 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 complainant's two tolas gold chain, 25 grams gold Bracelet and two gold rings. 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. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and he was arrested on 17.09.2024. The petitioner approached learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 02.01.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Jagjeet Singh @ Jeeta. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 05.08.2025 passed in **CRM-M-25996-2025**, whereby, co-accused Jagjeet Singh @ Jeeta has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 17.09.2024. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has endorsed the factum of grant of bail



CRM-M-48741-2025

-3-

to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Jagjeet Singh @ Jeeta. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 17.09.2024. Co-accused, namely, Jagjeet Singh @ Jeeta is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with him.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

7. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

05.09.2025
sharmila

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No