



CRM-M-56915-2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

250

CRM-M-56915-2025
Decided on : 02.12.2025

AMANDEEP SINGH ALIAS AMAN
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. S.S. Rangi, Senior Advocate, with
Mr. Fateh Sahota, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Amandeep Singh @ Aman, aged about 33 years	58	17.03.2025	124 of BNS and 7 of the Drugs and Magic Remedies (Objectionable Advertisement) Act, 1954	City Sangrur	Sangrur

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that complainant, Sukhvir Singh, lodged the FIR alleging that he had come across an advertisement on Facebook and Instagram posted by one



Aman, who was purportedly running a salon in Khanna. In the advertisement, Aman claimed that the application of a medicine provided by him would result in the re-growth of hair on bald individuals. Relying on this representation, complainant purchased the said medicine; however, instead of experiencing any hair growth, he developed itching on his scalp. Consequently, the complaint was lodged, leading to the registration of the impugned FIR against the petitioner.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that no offence under Section 124 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) is made out.

It is further argued that Section 7 of the Drugs and Magic Remedies (Objectionable Advertisements) Act, 1954, prescribes a maximum sentence of six months, whereas petitioner has already been in custody for approximately 3 months and 3 days. Thus, counsel prays that petitioner be granted regular bail in the present case.

4. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 01.12.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 03 months and 03 days period inside jail and there is no other case registered against him.



4. Learned State counsel has also filed status report dated 01.12.2025 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

5. Learned State counsel relies upon paragraph No.4 of the status report, wherein the Medical Board comprising three doctors from the Civil Hospital, Sangrur, has reported as under:—

- *“The cause of reaction was severe irritant contact dermatitis causing severe damage to skin and swelling of eyes.*
- *The patient presented with c/o redness, foreign body sensation, watering and swelling of both UL/LL Both eyes’. They suffered from irritant conjunctivitis. It is kind of conjunctivitis caused by contact with irritant.*
- *Vision loss can occur if the cornea gets involved. Possibility cannot be ruled out.*
- *All the injuries were simple in nature.”*

6. Learned State counsel further submits that the use of such substances could potentially lead to loss of vision. However, in the present case, fortunately, no such consequence has occurred. Therefore, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

7. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

8. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing



CRM-M-56915-2025

4

bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

02.12.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO