



CRM-M-53180-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-53180-2025

Date of Decision: 09.10.2025

Ramandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Charanjit Singh Bakhshi, Advocate and
Ms. Mallika Passi, 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.17 dated 06.02.2024 under Sections 379-B(2), 452, 34 IPC (Sections 411, 201 added lateron) IPC, registered at Police Station Goraya, District Jalandhar (Rural).
2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Parveen Kaur. It was alleged that on 04.02.2024, at about 02:00 P.M., she was present at her house with her daughter, namely, Harman and son, namely, Jashnpreet Singh. Harsimran Parmar came to her house and thereafter, 02 other unknown persons entered into her house. One of the young man was wearing a police uniform. Three of them got together and the young man, who was in police uniform, took a knife from the kitchen and started threatening her. Harsimran Parmar snatched gold chain with locket weighing about 02 tolas and thereafter, they escaped from there. On seeing this, her daughter, Harman and son, Jashnpreet Singh tried to chase them. However the accused escaped in their white car parked in the street. Thus the request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the



investigation commenced. The supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded on 06.02.2024 wherein the petitioner was named as one of the accused. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 07.03.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 21.05.2025. Earlier the petitioner approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-20092-2024 and CRM-M-48876-2024, however, the same were allowed to be dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 04.07.2024 and 02.04.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present third 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, Amrit Singh. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 03.09.2025 passed in **CRM-M-14911-2025**, whereby, co-accused Amrit Singh has been granted regular bail by this Court. He has submitted that the complainant in the present case has been examined before the trial Court, however, qua the petitioner he has not supported the case of the prosecution. 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, Amrit Singh. He has placed



CRM-M-53180-2025

-3-

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 07.03.2024. Co-accused, namely, Amrit Singh is on bail and the case of the petitioner as stated is at par with them. Custody certificate of the petitioner shows that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 06 months & 14 days as on 23.09.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in one more case. As submitted before this Court, the complainant has not supported the case of the prosecution during his examination before the trial court.

7. 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.

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

09.10.2025

sharmila

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