



CRM-M-5317-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-5317-2026

Date of Decision: 30.04.2026

Paramjit Singh @ Pamma

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Sahil Goel, Advocate,
for the petitioner (through VC).

Mr. Kuljinder Dhindsa, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.72 dated 20.05.2025, registered under Sections 109, 132, 221 of BNS, 2023 (Section 303(2) BNS added lateron) (charges framed under Sections 303, 345(3), 317(2) BNS and Sections 25/25(1-B) of the Arms Act and Sections 21(B0-61-85 of NDPS Act), at Police Station Adampur, District Jalandhar Rural.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant ASI Parminder Singh. It was alleged that on 20.05.2025 he alongwith the police party were checking the vehicle at the check point. At about 5:40 AM, one Mahindra Bolero vehicle came at a high speed from Mehtiana side. They signaled the vehicle to stop, but the driver of the above noted vehicle without caring about the checkpoint, broke the checkpoint and in order to crush him and other police officials under the vehicle, he deliberately accelerated. Thereupon, driver of the above noted vehicle turned the vehicle towards him and the Crime



CRM-M-5317-2026

-2-

Branch In Charge, upon which they managed to escape before the vehicle could hit them. Thereafter, the said vehicle hit the milestone and an iron board on the side of the road, due to which the vehicle got stopped. The driver alighted from the vehicle and while running from the spot, he fired from his pistol on the police party with the intention of killing them. Then the police party counter fired in the air to stop the driver from firing and shouted loudly directing him to surrender before the police, but the driver fired another shot with the intention of killing the police party. Then the police party shot the driver on the leg with service revolver of .32 bore, which hit the left leg of the driver and he fell down & his pistol also fell on the ground. The driver of the said vehicle was caught by the police party, who disclosed his name as Paramjit Singh alias Pamma (petitioner). During the search of above noted vehicle of accused 15 grams and two pistols of .32 bore alongwith six live cartridges without any permit or license of heroin were recovered. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 09.12.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner has been alleged to have fired



at the check point, but no one got injured. It is rather the police party who fired upon the petitioner which hit the petitioner on his leg. He submits that recovery of 15 grams of heroin, two pistol and six live cartridges was planted upon the petitioner to implicate in a serious case. He submits that thought the petitioner is involved in 36 other cases, however, in majority of the cases, he has been acquitted, in rest of the cases, he is on bail. He submits that it is because of the antecedents of the petitioner, he has been implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner is behind the bars from the last 11 months, but there is no material progress in the trial. He, thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender. He submits that the petitioner fired on the police officials at the check point. He further contends that in retaliation, the police fired, which hit on the leg of the petitioner. It is contended that after the arrest of the petitioner 15 grams of heroin, two pistols alongwith six live cartridges were recovered from the petitioner. On instructions, he submits that the investigation is completed, charges are framed and out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, 01 witness has been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner though has been alleged to have fired at the police officials, however, there is no fire injury received by them. However, it is the petitioner who suffered fire arm injury from the fire made by the



CRM-M-5317-2026

-4-

police. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 10 months & 24 days as on 29.04.2026. It further shows that the petitioner is facing prosecution in in 37 other cases, out of which in two cases, he is on bail, in one case he has been acquitted and in one case he has already undergone the sentence awarded to him. Out of 21 prosecution witnesses, 01 witness has been examined.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

30.04.2026

sharmila

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No2