



233

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

**CRM-M No.14911 of 2025  
Date of decision : 03.09.2025**

**Amrit Singh****.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ****\*\*\*\*\***

Present :- Mr. Jagat Vir Dhindsa, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

**\*\*\*\*****RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.17, dated 06.02.2024, under Sections 452, 379-B(2), 411, 201, 34 of IPC, 1860, 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 men was wearing a police uniform. 03 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 06.03.2024 wherein the petitioner was named as one of the accused. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 06.03.2024. 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 07.09.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the occurrence in the present case has taken place on 04.02.2024 whereas the petitioner has been named in the FIR after about a month, i.e. on 06.03.2024. He has submitted that even otherwise, as per the case of prosecution, the allegations of snatching and threatening are against the co-accused and not against the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 06.03.2024, however there is no progress in the trial, rather, the



prosecution witnesses are intentionally delaying the trial. He has submitted that the material witnesses, i.e. the complainant has already been examined and thus, there is no probability of threatening the complainant by the petitioner. He has submitted that though the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases, however he is on bail in those cases. He has thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner has played an active role in the commission of offence as he was along with the co-accused. She has submitted that the petitioner is involved in 02 other cases as well. She, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, 14 witnesses still remain to be examined. She has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case has taken place on 04.02.2024. The petitioner was named in the supplementary statement recorded a month thereafter, i.e. on 06.03.2024. The allegations of snatching and threatening, as submitted, are against the co-accused. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year, 05 months and 24 days as on 02.09.2025. Custody Certificate further shows that the petitioner is



involved in 02 other cases. Out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, 14 witnesses still remain to be examined. Material witnesses already stand examined.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail. 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

**03.09.2025**

*rittu*

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

:  
:

Yes/No  
Yes/No

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE**