



CRM-M-21588-2025

-1-

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

238

CRM-M-21588-2025

Date of decision : 30.04.2025

Arjan Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.. Respondent

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

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

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)**

The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in FIR No.237 dated 01.06.2023, under Section 379B(2)IPC, (Sections 323 & 201 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Goindwal Sahib, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is an unexplained delay of 06 days in lodging the FIR. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was one of the three persons having muffled faces inflicted datar blows on the head of the complainant and snatched his mobile phone and ran away. However, the petitioner was not named in the FIR and had been arraigned as an accused on the statement of co-accused. Learned counsel further stated that the co-accused, namely, Mandeep Singh @ Manu and Talwinder Singh @ Tittu have been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court in CRM-M-45530-2023 and CRM-M-2579-2024 on 07.11.2023 & 14.02.2024 (Annexures P-1 & P-2 respectively). The petitioner is in custody since 18.06.2023 and prays that he be released on bail.



CRM-M-21588-2025

3. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in Court which indicates that the petitioner is in custody for 01 year, 10 months & 11 days. Learned State counsel, upon instructions, submits that although challan was presented on 02.09.2023 but charges are yet to be framed. He also submits that the petitioner is involved in three more cases.

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

5. In view of the above submission of learned counsel(s) and the fact that the petitioner is in custody 01 year, 10 months & 11 days; co-accused(s) have been granted the concession of regular bail; since the charges have not been framed and the trial is likely to take time, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, I deem it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

6. 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 bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

7. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

30.04.2025  
A. Kaundal

(H.S.GREWAL)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No