

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

2025:PHHC:172693



CRM-M-68415-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10.12.2025

KARANPREET SINGH @ KARAN @ KALA

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.119 dated 07.06.2024, under Section(s) 379-B(2) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 411 and 34 of the IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Sadar, Amritsar.

2 Briefly summarized, the facts of the present case are that on 07.06.2024, at approximately 6:30 p.m., the complainant was proceeding on foot towards Batala Road. Upon reaching near Mustafabad, close to the Power

Station on a deserted stretch of road, he was allegedly surrounded by six unknown young men. One of them was carrying a knife, while the others were empty-handed. They demanded that he hand over whatever belongings he had. One of the assailants allegedly drew a chhura (knife) from his waistband, placed it on the complainant's neck, and the others searched his pockets, forcibly taking away his mobile phone make a REALME 8i from the pocket of his jeans. The complainant stated that upon his raising an alarm, the six individuals fled, and he chased after them. As he ran behind them, bystanders in the locality purportedly identified the six youths as Veeru, son of Kundan Lal; Panni, son of Tarsem Singh; Sawan @ Kalu, son of Jasbir Singh; Raja @ Jasarah, son of Satwinder Singh; Kaka, son of Labh Singh; and Karan @ Kala (the present petitioner) all residents of Mustafabad, Amritsar. The complainant further stated that since the assailants' faces were uncovered, he would be able to identify them upon being confronted.

3 Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that case of the petitioner is identical to the co-accused Mohit Kumar @ Veeru to whom concession of regular bail has been granted by this Court vide order dated 28.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-65859-2025. He submits that although the petitioner has undergone custody for a period shorter by about one month, the merits of his case stand on a stronger footing than that of co-accused Mohit Kumar @ Veeru, inasmuch as no recovery whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner.

4 State counsel does not dispute the facts noticed above.

5 Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions advanced as well as the fact that the similarly

placed co-accused, Mohit Kumar @ Veeru, has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 28.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-65859-2025, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

6 It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

7 The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

December 10, 2025.
raj arora

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE

: Yes/No

: Yes/No