



CRM-M-56228-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-56228-2025
Date of Decision: 14.10.2025

Gulab Singh Petitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.69 dated 18.04.2024 under Sections 224, 341, 506, 353, 186, 34, 120-B IPC and Sections 25(1AB), 25(6), 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 212, 216, 323 IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Gursher Singh. It was alleged that on 15.04.2024, jail staff arrested accused, namely, Charanjit Singh @ Raju, who was confined in Goindwal Sahib Jail in FIR No.172/2023, under Sections 307, 186, 427, 34 of IPC and Sections 25, 54, 59-A of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Jhabal. As Charanjit Singh @ Raju was to be operated, he was taken to Civil Hospital, Tarn Taran in police custody. He was being guarded in the ward of the hospital. The keys of the handcuffs were with the guards only. In the night, at about 02:10 a.m., Gulab Singh (petitioner), son of Karam Singh along with 02 other unknown persons entered the room and he fired at the complainant. Thereafter they



forcibly took out the keys of handcuffs from his pocket and got freed the accused, namely, Charanjit Singh @ Raju. All of them took away Charanjit Singh @ Raju on the motorcycle. Thus the request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 25.04.2024. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 09.09.2025. 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, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail to the petitioner on the basis of parity with that of the co-accused, namely, Sukhchain Singh @ Mongli. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 03.09.2025 passed in **CRM-M-47775-2025**, whereby, co-accused Sukhchain Singh @ Mongli has been granted regular bail by this Court. He submits that maximum sentence which could be awarded to the petitioner is of two years, however, the petitioner is behind bars from the last 1½ years. He submits that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail as the case of the petitioner is similar to that of the said co-accused, who has already been granted bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is distinguishable from that of the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court, as the petitioner is the main accused in this case. On instructions,



he has submitted that charges have been framed, however, no witness has been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 25.04.2024. Co-accused, namely, Sukhchain Singh @ Mongli has been granted bail by this Court. As submitted before this Court, no witness has been examined out of total 15 prosecution witnesses. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 05 months & 12 days as on 13.10.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides, 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. 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.

7 Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

14.10.2025

sharmila

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