



CRM-M-36169-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

241

CRM-M-36169-2025
Decided on : 16.07.2025

AMRITDEEP SINGH ALIAS JASHANDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Neeraj Kalair, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Amritdeep Singh @ Jashandeep Singh, aged about 18 years	0133	08.07.2024	109, 115, 191(3), 190, 103, 61(2) of BNS and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act	Kamboj	Amritsar Rural

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner (accused) submits that the occurrence took place on 08.07.2024, and on the same day, the FIR in question was registered. The deceased in the present case is Sukhdev



Singh, who was the brother of the complainant, Hardev Singh. As per the FIR, Akashdeep Singh is the main accused, who is attributed with causing a single fire shot injury to the deceased, Sukhdev Singh. The other named accused in the FIR are Arshdeep Singh @ Akash, Lovepreet Singh @ Murabba, Kalu, Karan, Dana, and Shinder. Additionally, the FIR also mentions that 10-11 other unknown persons were involved. Thus, learned counsel submits that name of the petitioner or any specific role has not been mentioned in the FIR. Further, counsel points out that it was only after two days, i.e., on 10.07.2024, that a supplementary statement was recorded of the complainant, Hardev Singh, in which he named seven more accused, namely: Manbir Singh @ Bonni, Sajan, Jasandeep Singh @ Jasan (petitioner herein), Gurdev Singh, Kashmir Singh @ Ghagga, Joban Singh, and Rohit Kumar. They all were stated to be armed with *datars* at the time of alleged occurrence. However, except just mentioning the name of the petitioner, no specific role has been assigned to him in the supplementary statement. Learned counsel also submits that it is unclear what source of information led the complainant to involve seven more persons in the murder case of his brother, especially when only one fire shot has been attributed to the co-accused Akashdeep Singh.

Further submits that co-accused Kashmir Singh @ Ghagga (petitioner in CRM-M-8052-2025) and Gurdev Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-59662-2024) who are similarly situated to the petitioner, have already been granted concession of bail by this Court, vide orders dated



18.02.2025 and 24.02.2025, respectively. Thus, claiming the principle of parity, learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel is unable to controvert any of the factual submissions addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner and submits that after completion of investigation, challan has been submitted, however, charges are yet to be framed.

4. On being asked by the Court, there is no satisfactory reply with learned State counsel, as to for what substantial reason further custody of the petitioner is going to serve any purpose to the prosecution.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record with their able assistance.

6. Considering the totality of circumstances, and the submissions addressed by both sides, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case.



Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

16.07.2025

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~

Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO