

2026:PHHC:032005



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

122

CRM-M-71852-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.02.2026

AMAN BHOLA

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Ashish Soi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-51679-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

MAIN CASE

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.120 dated 03.09.2020 under Sections 391, 395 and 397 of IPC and Section 25/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Sadar Ludhina, District Ludhiana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused entered the premises where the complainant and his companions were gambling. The petitioner and his associates looted the complainant of Rs.14,50,000/- approximately as well their valuables like gold chain and rings. The complainant has specifically named the petitioner and his associates.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that even though the petitioner has been named by the complainant, but no recovery has been effected from him. He further submits that although the petitioner is involved in one more case under Section 302 of I.P.C., however, he has been acquitted in the said case. Even all other co-accused of the petitioner have been granted regular bail vide

different orders (Annexures P-3 to P-8). He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months and 26 days.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the present petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months and 26 days.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 04 months and 26 days and similarly placed co-accused have already been granted bail coupled with the fact that the petitioner already stands acquitted in the other case in which he was involved, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner also deserves the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

FEBRUARY 26, 2026.

Rajender

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No