



CRM-M-33779-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-33779-2025

Date of Decision: 07.07.2025

Parminder Singh @ Lalli

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. H.S.Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S.Toor, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.46 dated 23.06.2023 under Sections 302, 212 and 120-B IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Talwandi Bhai, District Ferozepur.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Amrit Lal Chhabra. It was alleged that on 23.06.2023, he and his nephew had come to their shop in the morning. In the afternoon when they were about to go to their house for having lunch, they asked one Prem Kumar to look after their shop. After having lunch, they reached their shop. Then at about 02:30 PM, two persons with muffled faces parked their motorcycle in front of their shop. The person sitting pillion on the motorcycle was holding 9mm pistol in his hand, got down and entered their shop and started firing. He fired 6-7 rounds at Prem Kumar who received firearm injury on his thigh of left leg. They immediately shifted to Medicity Hospital, Moga. However, he died during treatment. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrayed as an accused in the



present case and during investigation, he was arrested 08.12.2023. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozpur praying for grant of bail. However, after hearing counsel for both the sides, the same was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozpur vide order dated 14.05.2025. Hence, being aggrieved, petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

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, Nishan Singh. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 16.01.2025 passed in **CRM-M-34744-2024**, whereby, co-accused Nishan Singh has been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that allegations against the petitioner is that of the main accused before committing the offence, stayed in the house of the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is in custody since 08.12.2023. 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 endorsed the factum of grant of bail to the co-accused of the petitioner as stated above and has not denied that the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, namely, Nishan Singh. He has submitted that out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, none 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 08.12.2023 Co-accused, namely, Nishan Singh is on bail and the case of the petitioner as



stated is at par with him. Out of total 21 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 06 months & 21 days as on 05.07.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case.

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 on the basis of parity. 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.

8. It is being clarified that in case the petitioner does not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, his custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

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

07.07.2025

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No