



216

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-27468-2025
Decided on : 11.11.2025

Arshdeep Singh alias Akashdeep Singh

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sukhbir Maandi, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Arshdeep Singh alias Akashdeep Singh	11	15.01.2025	310(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and 25 of the Arms Act, 1959	Dera Bassi	SAS Nagar

2. As per the FIR lodged at the instance of complainant – Shehjad Ali, on 14.01.2025, four boys, three armed with kirpans (swords) and one with a pistol, entered the complainant’s premises with muffled faces. By threatening the complainant party at gunpoint and causing injuries with the kirpans, they allegedly took away a sum of ₹5,81,000/-. Subsequently, during investigation, petitioner – Arshdeep Singh alias Akashdeep Singh – was involved in the case on the allegation that he was



waiting outside the office of the complainant and had reached there while driving the car in which the four assailants had come.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the petitioner was already known to the police officials, as he had earlier been involved in a false NDPS case, and due to that prior knowledge, he has now been unnecessarily roped in and projected as the driver of the car allegedly used by the assailants. It is further argued that the petitioner is a young man of 25 years of age, with no previous record of involvement in any offence of robbery or similar nature. Thus, he deserves to be treated differently viz-à-viz the main accused, and be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 10.11.2025 and the status report dated 11.11.2025 in Court today. The same are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at the appropriate place. Copies thereof have been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the FIR was registered on 15.01.2025, and during the course of investigation, on 17.01.2025, the complainant again appeared before the Investigating Officer and made a supplementary statement. In that statement, the complainant disclosed that on 14.01.2025, at about 11:40 p.m., a white i10 car bearing registration No. PB10-HH-1917 had come to his office, occupied by five unknown persons, who committed the crime. It was on the basis of this supplementary statement that the name of the petitioner – Arshdeep Singh @ Akashdeep Singh – surfaced.



6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the record, and carefully gone through the status report dated 11.11.2025 filed today.

7. The alleged incident of robbery took place on 14.01.2025, while the FIR was lodged the next day on 15.01.2025. Significantly, in the initial version of the FIR, neither the name of the petitioner nor any specific clue regarding his involvement was mentioned. The assailants were described as having muffled faces. It was only two days later, in the supplementary statement dated 17.01.2025, that the complainant disclosed details about the car and mentioned the petitioner's name. How the complainant acquired such knowledge subsequently, is not yet explained and will be a matter for examination during trial.

Further, prosecution's case against the petitioner appears to have been primarily built upon his own alleged disclosure statement and those of co-accused persons. Whether the said disclosures are genuine and admissible in evidence, or have been recorded merely to strengthen the investigation, shall be determined by the learned trial Court at the appropriate stage. It is also not disputed that the petitioner has no prior record of involvement in any case of similar nature.

8. Petitioner was not named in the FIR, and even the initial version did not mention the presence of any fifth accused or the use of a particular vehicle. He has been in custody since January 2025, i.e. for the last about nine months and eleven days. Learned State counsel has fairly pointed out that though the petitioner was earlier known to the police in connection with an NDPS case, i.e., FIR No.13 dated 27.02.2021, under Sections 21(b), 29, 61, and 85 of the NDPS Act, registered at Police Station Khalra, District



Tarn Taran, he is not shown to have any conviction in that matter.

9. In view of the above circumstances, and without commenting on the merits of the case lest it may prejudice the outcome of the trial, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner – Arshdeep Singh alias Akashdeep Singh. Accordingly, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court, if not required in any other case.

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

11. The observations made here-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 11, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No