



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

210

CRM-M-63732-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.08.2025

AKASHDEEP SINGH @ KUJJA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS), seeking regular bail in FIR No.179 dated 13.07.2024 under Sections 308(4), 62, 351 BNS and Sections 25, 27, 54 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station, Jandiala, District Amritsar.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the on 12.07.2024 at about 11.44 P.M., the complainant heard some noise outside his house and he came out but saw nobody. Thereafter, he checked his CCTV footage upon which he found that 02 unidentified muffled persons riding a motorcycle came and stopped the motorcycle outside his house. They fired two bullets on the upper side of his house and then fired two bullets at the gate of his house. After that they left on their motor cycle and went towards the old bus stand. Thereafter, he got a extortion call on whatsapp call demanding a ransom of Rs.1 Crore by the petitioner and his co-accused.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends the petitioner was arrested in another FIR No.119 dated 02.07.2024 under Sections 25, 54, 59 of



the Arms Act (Sections 21, 61, 85 of the NDPS Act added later on), registered at Police Station Beas, Amritsar and was already in custody at the time of alleged occurrence. He further submits that the petitioner has been named on the basis of a disclosure statements of his co-accused namely, Iqbal Singh and Amardeep Singh. He further contends that in the present case, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year and 16 days.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner has undergone custody period of 01 year and 16 days. He further states that the petitioner was in touch with his co-accused through a mobile phone, however, no such mobile phone has been recovered from the petitioner who was already in custody at the time of alleged occurrence. Moreover, he is involved in 06 more cases.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the above and the fact that although the petitioner is involved in 06 more cases and apart from the disclosure statement which is not substantiated by any other corroborative evidence, there is no other evidence against the petitioner in the present case; the custody undergone by the petitioner is 01 year and 16 days; since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.



9. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

22nd August, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No