



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

CRM-M-18602-2026

Date of decision : 16.04.2026

Harsimranjot Singh Parmar @ Harsimran ParmarPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Ankush Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.17 dated 06.02.2024, under Sections 452, 379-B(2), 411, 201, 34 of the IPC (now Sections 333, 304, 317(2), 238, 3(5) of BNS), registered at Police Station Goraya District Jalandhar.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Parveen Kaur. It was alleged that on 04.02.2024, at about 02:00 P.M., she was present at her house with her daughter, namely, Harman and son, namely, Jashnpreet Singh. Harsimran Parmar (present petitioner) came to her house and thereafter, 02 other unknown persons entered into her house. One of the young men was wearing a police uniform. 03 of them got together and the young man, who was in police uniform, took a knife from the kitchen and started threatening her. Harsimran Parmar snatched gold chain with locket weighing about 02 tolas and thereafter, they escaped from there. On seeing this, her daughter, Harman and son, Jashnpreet Singh tried to chase them.



However the accused escaped in their white car parked in the street. Thus the request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 07.03.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 06.12.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has contended that similarly situated co-accused have already been granted bail by this Court in CRM-M-14911-2025 and CRM-M-53180-2025 vide orders dated 03.09.2025 and 09.10.2025, respectively. He has submitted that though the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases, however, the co-accused namely, Amrit Singh and Ramandeep Singh, who have already been granted the bail by this Court, were also involved in other cases. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind the bars from last more than 02 years and complainant already stands examined. He thus, has submitted that on the basis of parity with co-accused, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner.

He has submitted that the case of the petitioner is distinguishable from



that of the present petitioner as he knew the family of the complainant, however, he does not deny the fact that co-accused, namely, Amrit Singh and Ramandeep Singh, are already on bail. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 18 prosecution witnesses, complainant already stands examined. He has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case has taken place on 06.02.2024. As submitted, co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 02 years, 01 month and 04 days as on 13.04.2026. Custody Certificate further shows that the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases. Out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, complainant 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. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.



7. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

16.04.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No