



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-64533-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 07.07.2025

Paramdalip Singh @ Sukhchain Singh @ Pamma
... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab
... Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Gagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate,
for the petitioner.
Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

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
Paramdalip Singh @ Sukhchain Singh @ Pamma	310	28.11.2022	379-B/34 of IPC and 27 of Arms Act, 1959	Jandiala	Amritsar

2. As per allegations, petitioner along with other co-accused forcibly took away car model Swift from the complainant. During investigation, petitioner was arrested on 05.08.2023, but no recovery was effected from the petitioner. Petitioner also contends that alleged stolen car has also not been recovered from anywhere by the Investigating Officer.



Thus, submits that there being no link or the admissible evidence, petitioner cannot be alleged to be connected directly with the incident of snatching of car.

3. While opposing the prayer for bail, Mr. Bhullar, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions, submits that after conducting investigation, challan has already been submitted. And, after framing of charges, two of the prosecution witnesses have been examined out of total 10 in number. He also points out that petitioner is involved in 6 other case of similar nature and, therefore, being an habitual offender does not deserve any concession.

4. I have gone through the petition and heard both the sides.

5. From the paper book, it is noticed that two of the co-accused, namely, Gurleen Singh and Jaskaran Singh @ Gaggi have already been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 09.11.2023, passed in CRM-M-55527-2023 (P-2) and 23.05.2024, passed in CRM-M-62126-2023 (P-3), respectively.

6. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, is unable to create any distinction with the roles of both the other co-accused and, therefore, this Court is not inclined to take a different view from the one already taken by a coordinate Bench in the petitions filed by the co-accused.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing 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.



8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.
9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

(Sanjay Vashisth)
Judge

07.07.2025
Rajan

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