



CRM-M-48409-2025

1

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

(203)

CRM-M-48409-2025
Date of Decision:-26.09.2025

Amarjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. Sarju Puri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Japjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed *inter alia* praying for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 154 dated 29.11.2024 under Sections 64, 103(1) and 238 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated his contention as recorded in the order dated 04.09.2025, which reads as under:

xxx xxx xxx

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely entangled in the present case as he has no role to play in the commission of offence. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner is the owner of the Dhaba-cum-hotel where the accused and the deceased (sister of the complainant) visited and on account of the fact that main accused-Lovepreet had requested for his help to take the



deceased to the Doctor. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner left the spot after dropping the deceased and accused-Lovepreet at their house and now he is facing the trial for helping somebody.”

3. Learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner, while claiming himself to be a good samaritan, ought to have taken the deceased to the hospital instead of taking her to the house of the main accused, and therefore, he has played an active role in the commission of the offence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, being the owner of the hotel, acted promptly on being informed by a customer in the hotel that somebody was unwell. He being the owner of the hotel initially took the concerned person to the hospital, but it was only at the specific request of the main accused, Lovepreet Singh that he thereafter took both the deceased and Lovepreet Singh to the later's residence, dropped them there, and subsequently returned to his own place. Learned counsel for the petitioner further relies upon the disclosure statement of Lovepreet Singh to substantiate that the petitioner has no role to play in the commission of the offence. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the charges have been framed and despite opportunity, the complainant has not stepped into the witness box to get his testimony recorded and further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 09 months.

5. Learned State counsel has also filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court today, which is taken on record, according to which the petitioner is in custody for the last 9 months and 19 days as on 25.09.2025.



6. In light of the above and considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than nine months and the fact that the trial is likely to take a long time, therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody, hence, the petitioner is entitled to the grant of the concession of regular bail.

7. Without commenting upon the merits of the case, the present petition stands allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail if not required in any other case on furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned. The petitioner shall, however, be released on the following conditions:

- i The petitioner shall declare his ordinary place of residence and the mobile number used by him.
- ii The petitioner will not switch off his mobile and in case of any technical glitch, he has to give an alternate number, which will be available in his absence.
- iii The petitioner will mark his presence before the SHO concerned, after every 15 days and in case the SHO refuses to mark his presence, he is permitted to make an application before the Illaqa Magistrate, concerned.
- iv The petitioner will not leave the country without the prior permission of the Court, for which he will submit the copy of his passport also. However, in case the petitioner does not possess a passport, then he shall file an undertaking to the said effect before being released.

The petitioner shall abide by the terms and conditions as imposed in addition to Section 483 of BNSS, 2023.



CRM-M-48409-2025

4

8. However, nothing stated above shall be construed as a final expression of opinion on the merits of the case and this order shall not be considered as parity *qua* any other co-accused in any manner whatsoever.

9. It is further made clear that, in case, the petitioner is found involved in any such activity once again, the State is at liberty to promptly move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail detailing out the circumstances and violation of conditions of bail.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

September 26, 2025

parul

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:-	Yes/No