

212 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025.PHHC:169982



CRM-M-67331-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 05.12.2025

GURMEJ SINGH ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Ms. Divya Gulati, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rohit Hans, D.A.G., Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No. 101 dated 24.08.2024, under Sections 420, 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station Khilchian, District Amritsar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Sarabjit Singh received a sum of approximately Rs.58 Lakhs from the complainant. It is alleged that the petitioner, along with co-accused Sarabjit Singh and others misrepresented themselves as individuals engaged in poultry farming and financing business. The petitioner along with Sarabjit Singh and Gagandeep Singh assured the complainant that the invested amount would yield profitable returns. The entire money was handed over to the petitioner. Subsequently, co-accused Sarabjit Singh and Gagandeep Singh became unreachable.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The role of the petitioner is stated to be general in nature. No specific allegations of entrustment have been made against the petitioner in the FIR. The petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 16 days.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rohit Hans, D.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner on the ground of gravity of allegations. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 16 days.
6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
7. Considering the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and the fact that the role of the petitioner is stated to be general in nature, no specific allegations of entrustment have been made against the petitioner in the FIR; the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 months and 16 days; though the challan has been presented, the trial of the case is yet to commence; therefore, continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.
8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.
9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

05.12.2025

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