



133

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.41374 of 2025
Date of Decision: 24.02.2026

Beant Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. M. S. Kathuria, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Present fifth petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.97, dated 20.05.2024, under Sections 436, 427 IPC (section 120-B IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Khanna City-2, Khanna, District Ludhiana, Punjab.
2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Charanjit Singh. It was alleged that the complainant bought a new car bearing registration No.PB-26-J-2538 mark Hyundai Creta under his daughter-in-law's name. It was alleged that on 18.05.2024, the car was parked outside their house and in the morning, at about 03:45 A.M., son of the complainant saw that the car was on fire. They rushed outside and saw that the lid of the fuel tank was uprooted and the tank of car was set on fire. It was alleged that some unknown person has put the car on fire. The request was made to take



legal action against the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 25.05.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 18.12.2024. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court four times praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-33963-2024, CRM-M-53041-2024, CRM-M-24515-2025 and CRM-M-29196-2025, however the same were dismissed vide orders dated 12.08.2024, 29.10.2024, 13.05.2025 and 29.05.2025, respectively. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present fifth petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that neither the petitioner has been named in the FIR nor any overt act has been attributed to him, however, he has been roped in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 1 year and 09 months. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He has submitted that the co-accused of the petitioner are



already on bail. He has thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Short reply dated 21.02.2026 by way of an affidavit of Vinod Kumar, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Police District Khanna, District Ludhiana on behalf of the respondent-State has been filed by learned State counsel today in the Court, which is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that one of the co-accused in the present case was juvenile at the time of occurrence of crime and both the co-accused have been granted the concession of bail. He has submitted that during the investigation, it is the petitioner, who has hired both the co-accused to put the car of the complainant on fire. He has submitted that during the investigation, it has been found that the petitioner had given an amount of Rs.23,00,000/- to the complainant for sending his daughter-in-law to abroad but neither she was sent abroad nor the complainant has returned his money, thus, to take the revenge, the petitioner in conspiracy with the co-accused has put the car of the complainant on fire. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is distinguishable from that of the co-accused, who have been granted bail. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 10 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses remain to be examined. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner in the present case was named on the basis

of disclosure statement of co-accused. One of the co-accused was juvenile at the time of occurrence of crime and both the co-accused have been granted bail. The petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 25.05.2024. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 09 months and 01 day as on 23.02.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of total 10 prosecution witnesses, 3 witnesses remain to be examined.

8. 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. 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.

9. 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 cases.

24.02.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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