



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

104

CRM-M-8012-2025(O&M)

Amit Kumar @ Dillon

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondents

And

CRM-M-13298-2025(O&M)

Inderjit Singh @ Indervir @ Inder

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondents

DATE OF DECISION : 6th March, 2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

* * *

Present : Mr.Rajesh K. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-8012-2025).

Mr.Tanheer Singh Bariana, Advocate and
Mr.Jangveer Singh Bariana, Advocate for the petitioner
(in CRM-M-13298-2025).

Mr.Neeraj Madaan, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

* * *

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. By this common order, afore-mentioned two bail petitions are being disposed of.
2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 of Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have 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	Distt.
Amit Kumar @ Dillon and Inderjit Singh @ Indervir @ Inder	110	14.05.2024	302, 452,148, 149 IPC later on added Sections 201 IPC, 120 B	Model Town	Hoshiarpur

3. As per the initial version of the complainant Babli, FIR was registered on 14.05.2024 against five accused, namely; i) Raveen Kumar @ Gulli, ii) Harry, iii) Lavish, iv) Elis and v) Honey. On 22.05.2024 i.e. after a period of 08 days of the registration of FIR, complainant Babli suffered a supplementary statement reiterating her earlier version and further stating that she has come to know that prior to the incident her son Rahul Gill (now deceased) had arguments with Raveen Kumar @ Gulli, who had threatened her son on telephone. She further disclosed that other identified persons accompanying the accused were Inderjit Singh @ Inder armed with Dattar (**petitioner in CRM-M-13298-2025**) and Honey



@ Billa armed with Khanda was actually Amit Kumar Dhillon (petitioner). After both the afore-mentioned accused were named in the supplementary statement, Amit Kumar Dhillon (petitioner) was arrested on 03.07.2024 and Inderjit Singh @ Indervir @ Inder was arrested on 10.08.2024.

4. Status report dated 25.02.2026 by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division City, District Hoshiarpur, filed along with a pen-drive in Court today, is taken on record. Copy supplied to counsel for the petitioner. Paragraphs No.13 and 14 of the said status report read as under:

“13. That it is submitted that as per CCTV footage of the occurrence, Harry, Lavish, Tarunvir Singh and Elis are seen causing injuries to the deceased inside the Octave showroom and petitioner and Inderjit Singh @ Indervir @ Inder were standing on their Aactiva outside the Octave showroom and they were waiting the co-accused Harry, co-accused Lavish, Elis and Tarunvir Singh and after causing injuries the co-accused Harry, co-accused Lavish, Elis and Tarunvir Singh went away from the occurrence on the Aactiva of the petitioners and the petitioners are not seen in the CCTV footage as they were standing outside of the OCTAVE cloth showroom where the CCTV footage of the OCTAVE clothes showroom was not covering them. The pen drive containing CCTV footage is annexed as Annexure R-1.

Role of Petitioner:

14. That it is submitted that although the petitioners are not named in the FIR, but they were named in the disclosure statement of co-accused Harry Kainth alias Chand as well as other co-accused and supplementary statement of



complainant Babli recorded on 22.05.2024 wherein she stated that name mentioned as Hani alias Billa armed with Khanda was actually petitioner – Amit Kumar Dhillon. Further the petitioners were also named in statement of eye-witness Kiran. Accordingly, the petitioners were nominated as accused vide DDR No.21 dated 25.05.2024. The petitioners suffered disclosure statements on 05.07.2024 wherein they also gave details of the occurrence. Therefore, the present petition is liable to be dismissed.”

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners, relying on the explanation given by the State, argue that no specific role of causing injuries is attributed to any of the petitioners in the supplementary statement and as per the CCTV footage, none of the petitioners, was present at the time of incident. To strengthen the submission, learned counsel also rely on the order dated 29.09.2025 passed in CRM-M-54035-2024 i.e. bail petition of co-accused Raveen Kumar @ Gulli, whose name was mentioned in the FIR, and who has already been granted bail by this Court. The co-ordinate Bench took notice of the submission that presence of co-accused Raveen Kumar @ Gulli has not been established from the CCTV obtained during investigation. Copy of the order dated 29.09.2025 produced in Court, is taken on record.

Thereupon, it is being argued that both the petitioners almost stand on the same footing and thus, claim bail on parity.

6. On advance notice and in response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel,



produces the custody certificates dated 05.03.2026 in Court today, which are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioners.

As per the custody certificates, in the present case, petitioner Amit Kumar has already undergone 01 year 07 months and 27 days, while petitioner Inderjit Singh has undergone 01 year 06 months and 21 days period inside jail and there is no other case registered against any of them.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance, this Court finds substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. Since no specific differentiation is pointed out in the cases of the petitioners and co-accused Raveen Kumar @ Gulli, who has already been granted bail, I am of the view that any longer incarceration of the petitioners in jail, is wholly unjustified, specifically when the trial is not going any headway.

8. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioners, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioners.

9. Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are allowed. Petitioners (Amit Kumar @ Dilon and Inderjit Singh @ Indervir @ Inder) are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their 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.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.
11. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, Trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.
12. Petitions stand disposed of.

March 06, 2026
gjn

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>