



324

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-65190-2024

Date of decision:-01.04.2025

**GURMEET SINGH @ SOURAV**... **Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB**... **Respondent****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.**

Present:- Mr. Devansh Khanna, Advocate, for  
Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Bhupinder Kumar Gupta, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJIV BERRY, J.(ORAL)**

The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, (BNSS), 2023, for grant of regular bail in the following case (Annexure P-1):-

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Dated</b>	<b>Sections</b>	<b>Police Station</b>
113	03.07.2024	384, 506, 120-B IPC (387, 364-A and 392 IPC added later on)	Civil Lines, District Amritsar

2. Arguments heard.

3. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He contends that the petitioner is in custody since 08.10.2024 and no recovery has been effected from him. He contends that the petitioner has been arrested



in this case on the disclosure statements of co accused Manak Suri and Paras Suri, the petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the allegations levelled in the FIR. He contends that after completion of investigation, challan has already been presented in Court, as such petitioner is no more required for further investigation. He further contends that in the meanwhile, a compromise has been effected between the parties, copy of which has been annexed as Annexure P-2 and on the basis thereof, has sought concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel referring to the reply submitted by the State has opposed the bail application by contending that petitioner alongwith co-accused had committed heinous crime, as such he is not entitled to the concession of bail. Hence prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.

5. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of complainant has categorically stated at bar that a compromise has been effected between the complainant and the petitioner and copy of which is annexed as Annexure P-2. He contends that he has specific instructions to say that the complainant has no objection in case the Court grants concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the instant case was registered against the petitioner and other co-accused on the complaint of Kamal Kant Sharma alleging that the petitioner alongwith other co-accused have committed robbery and took away 20 mobile phones and 4 laptops from his shop and also gave threats to him to extort money. Consequent upon the registration of FIR, the petitioner was arrested on 08.10.2024 and admittedly, no recovery was effected from the petitioner. After completion of investigation, challan has been presented in the

Court, wherein prosecution has cited 20 witnesses and till date none of them have been examined, as such, the conclusion of trial, to ascertain criminal liability, if any, of the petitioner will take sufficient long time. It is also worth mentioning that it is the categoric stand of the complainant that the matter has been compromised and he does not want to proceed further against the petitioner and he has no objection in case bail is granted to the petitioner. In these circumstances, no purpose would be served by detaining the petitioner any longer.

7. Consequently, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

9. Pending application(s) if any shall also stand disposed of.

**(SANJIV BERRY)**  
**JUDGE**

**01.04.2025**

Gyan

- |     |                            |        |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable?        | Yes/No |