

2025:PHHC:042574



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

CRM-M-6292-2025 (O&M)

Reserved on : 25.03.2025

Pronounced on : 28.03.2025

Rajbir Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Gurinder Singh Bhandari, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Swati Batra, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 136 dated 23.10.2024, registered under Sections 109, 111, 308(4) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act (Sections 111(5) and 112 of BNS added later on) at Police Station Dera Baba Nanak, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement of complainant Randeep Singh Bedi alleging therein that on the evening of 23.10.2024, one unknown person had come to his medical shop and had called him outside. When he reached there, the said person took out a pistol and fired a shot with the same thereby hitting his left thigh. On clamour being raised, he had managed to flee. He alleged that the attack was made to

2025:PHHC:042574



extort money from him as he had been receiving extortion calls. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Accused Anmol Singh was nominated as such on the basis of a secret information. He was arrested. Some other accused were also arrested. Accused Anmol Singh suffered a disclosure statement on the basis of which the present petitioner, who is his brother-in-law, had been nominated as an accused on the allegations that he was member of an organized crime syndicate and was assisting co-accused Anmol Singh by harbouring other accused as well as himself. The petitioner was arrested and is in custody since 05.11.2024. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the grounds and his counsel has argued that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Anmol Singh, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence against him. The allegations against him are that he is a member of an organized crime syndicate and had given shelter to other co-accused, which has no basis. He is in custody since 05.11.2024. Investigation stands concluded. Trial is likely to take time. His further detention would not serve any useful purpose. Similarly situated co-accused have already been granted concession of bail by this Court. On the grounds of parity, the petitioner too deserves the same benefit. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed by the respondent-State. It is submitted therein and learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender since as many as six other cases have

2025:PHHC:042574



been registered against him. There are chances of his committing similar offences or absconding, if extended benefit of bail. The allegations against him are grave in nature. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner is not named in the FIR. He is alleged to have been nominated as an accused on the basis of the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Anmol Singh. Co-accused, against whom similar allegations have been levelled, have already been granted concession of bail by this Court. He is in custody since 05.11.2024. Trial is likely to take time. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is no more required. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody anymore. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

28.03.2025

Parveen Sharma

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No