



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

226

CRM-M-29497-2025
Decided on : 25.09.2025

Vinod @ Vinod Kumar @ Rangila . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sandeep S. Majithia, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. At the outset, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 16.09.2025, in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. 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
Vinod @ Vinod Kumar @ Rangila	184	21.11.2024	111(1)(2)(B), 111(3), 114(4) of BNS, 2023 and 25(6, 7 & 8), 54 & 59 of the Arms Act1, 1959	Cantonment	Amritsar

3. After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, at some length, on 01.07.2025, following order was passed:-



“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
Vinod @ Vinod Kumar @ Rangila	184	21.11.2024	111(1)(2)(B), 111(3), 114(4) of BNS and 25(6, 7 & 8), 54 & 59 of the Arms Act	Cantonment	Amritsar

2. On advance notice, Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, has put in appearance and filed custody certificate dated 30.06.2025, which is taken on record. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place. Copy of the same also supplied to the learned counsel for the applicant/appellant.

3. FIR in the instant case has been registered before even effecting of the alleged recoveries.

4. As informed by learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, there is a recovery of 9 mm pistol known as Glock, which costs around Rs.20 lakhs. Apart the said weapon, 2 pistols of .32 bore along with 4 cartridges were also recovered from the other co-accused.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further argues that apart from the alleged recoveries that too from the main accused, there is no other evidence with the prosecution, or collected during investigation, that from which source, the weapons have been obtained by the accused persons.

6. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab is unable to rebut the contention of the petitioner’s counsel, particularly that nothing has been recovered from the petitioner, who is inside jail from the last 7 months. Faced with this, he seeks time to file a status report.

7 Adjourned to 25.09.2025.”

4. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner argues that FIR was registered even before affecting actual recovery of weapons from any of the accused. While referring to the status report dated 16.09.2025, learned counsel reads out paragraphs No.8, 9 & 10 and points out that though the petitioner had been arrested being a member of the organized criminal syndicate, but nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is inside jail since 21.11.2024 and investigation in the FIR has already been completed. However, charges are yet to be framed. Since arrest of the petitioner in the



present case is on account of only suspicion, that too on the basis of alleged secret information, and in regard to such information and apprehension of the prosecution agency, the same is yet to be established before the trial Court. Therefore, petitioner would otherwise remain in custody for an indefinite period until the charges are proved.

6. In the aforesaid status report, in paragraph No.15, details of other criminal cases registered against the petitioner in his past are mentioned. For reference, details of such cases are reproduced hereunder:-

- “i) *FIR No: 282 Date 02.09.2013 U/S 382,34 IPC PS Civil Line, Amritsar.*
- ii) *FIR No 222 Date 15.10.2013 U/S 186,420,285,34 IPC PS Cantonment Amritsar.*
- iii) *FIR No 04 Date 06.01.2014 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act, 307,148,149 IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- iv) *FIR No 286 Date 25.07.2014 U/S 21,22/61/85 NDPS ACT PS A Division Amritsar.*
- v) *FIR No 304 Date 04.11.2014 U/S 21,22/61/85 NDPS ACT PS Cantonment Amritsar.*
- vi) *FIR No 92 Date 10.04.2015 U/S 323,452,427,148,149 IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- vii) *FIR No. 162, Date 10.06.2015 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act,, 302,307,323,324,148,149 IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- viii) *FIR No 279 Date 02.08.2015 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act,, 379 IPC PS Civil Line Amritsar.*
- ix) *FIR No 219 Date 27.08.2015 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act, 307,506, 148,149 IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- x) *FIR No 142 Date 30.08.2015 U/S 379,34 IPC PS Kambo, Amritsar Rural*
- xi) *FIR No 63 Date 03.09.2015 U/S 25,27/54/59 Arm Act,, 307,34 IPC PS Islamabad, Amritsar.*
- xii) *FIR No 229 Date 04.09.2015 U/S 379 IPC PS Civil Line, Amritsar.*
- xiii) *FIR No 230 Date 04.09.2015 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act, 302,307,323,452, 148, 149 IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- xiv) *FIR No 250 Date 29.09.2015 U/S 174-A IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- xv) *FIR No 238 Date 06.10.2015 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act, 307,336,506, 148, 149 IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- xvi) *FIR No 260 Date 09.10.2015 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act, 379b,323,330 IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- xvii) *FIR No 274 Date 04.11.2015 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act, 379b,402,382,411 IPC PS Sultanwind Amritsar.*
- xviii) *FIR No 83 Date 19.03.2016 U/S 328,223,224,225,253, 120B IPC PS Civil Line, Amritsar.*
- xix) *FIR No 103 Date 07.05.2019 U/S 25/54/59 Arm Act, 307,353,324,186,225,341,379B IPC PS City KAPURTHALA.”*



7. There are total 19 cases, out of which majority of cases were registered in the years 2013, 2014 and 2015, with one case in the year 2016 and another in the year 2019. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in several of these cases petitioner has already been acquitted, while in others he is on bail.

8. Learned counsel further contends that even if the factual position in the present case is accepted in its entirety, the same may not necessarily prove that any offence has been committed by the petitioner. Thus, learned counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate dated 25.09.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. A copy thereof has been supplied to the counsel for the petitioner.

Referring to the details of 19 cases already mentioned in the custody certificate, learned State counsel submits that petitioner is a habitual offender and therefore does not deserve any leniency or concession of bail.

10. I have considered the rival submissions and noticed certain facts from the record. Out of total 19 cases, 17 cases are shown to have been registered up till the year 2015, and therefore, the fact cannot be ignored that in the last about 10 years, petitioner is shown to be involved only in two cases, i.e., one in the year 2016 and another in the year 2019. In these two cases also, it is not the case of the prosecution that the petitioner stands convicted. Though the charges in the present case are yet to be framed, but looking at the circumstances, applying the principle of the famous phrase that *“if every saint has a past, sinner also has a future”*, petitioner deserves to be afforded liberty with a view to enable him to rehabilitate himself in society.



11. Consequently, without making any comments over the merits of the case, the prayer for bail of the petitioner 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.

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

13. The observation 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.

14. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 25, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No