

2025:PHHC:109662



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.32412 of 2025
Date of Decision: 21.08.2025
Reserved on: 18.08.2025

Manpreet Singh @ Mani ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
47	11.03.2025	Gobindgarh Mandi, District Fatehgarh Sahib	310(2), 312, 191(3) and 190 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (For short 'BNS') and 25 of Arms Act, 1959

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Ajay Kumar alleging therein that he along with Kunal Verma used to deal in the business of scrap trading

2025:PHHC:109662



and was running an office at Preet Nagar. On the evening of 10.03.2025, he was present in his office along with Himanshu and Nikhil Gupta when a Swift car bearing No.HR-26-CW-0399 stopped outside his office. Six persons were sitting in the same. Five of them alighted from the vehicle and while knocking at the glass door of his office which was bolted from inside, they made an exhortation to open the door. Out of fear, the complainant did not open the same. One of those five persons then opened fired with a pistol at the glass door resulting into its damage. His companions ran from there and had hidden themselves upstairs. Those five persons then entered inside the office and assaulted the complainant. They damaged his Apple iphone and forcibly took away cash amount of Rs.15,50,000/- from the drawer of the office table and then escaped with the same.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On 16.03.2025, a secret information was received that the accused Basant Singh @ Rinku and Jaideep Singh were involved in the incident and they were roaming in the area with an intent to commit some other crime. They were apprehended while riding a motorbike which was not having any number plate. They even fired shots with their weapons but were apprehended from the spot as in self-defence, the members of police party had also fired shots with their service pistol and both of them had sustained firearm injuries. On asking, the accused Basant Singh @ Rinku and Jaideep Singh disclosed their names and particulars. On making search from the CCTV footage of the area wherein the incident had taken place, the accused Basant Singh @ Rinku and Jaideep Singh were found to be amongst the

2025:PHHC:109662



persons who had committed the subject crime. A separate FIR bearing No.51 was registered against them. The accused Basant Singh @ Rinku and Jaideep Singh were interrogated in this case and suffered disclosure statement admitting their involvement in this case. They also disclosed the names of the present petitioner i.e. Manpreet Singh @ Mani and other accused namely, Gurpreet Singh @ Dhoni, Uma Shankar, Ajay and Jaspal. The petitioner and co-accused Gurpreet Singh @ Dhoni were arrested on 18.03.2025. On interrogation, they admitted their involvement in commission of the subject crime and disclosed the names of other accused involved in the occurrence. The other co-accused were also arrested. Subsequently also disclosure statements had been suffered by them. The petitioner Manpreet Singh @ Mani got recovered a sum of Rs.1 lakh. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 24.03.2025. He was not named in the FIR. A false recovery has been planted upon him. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistants Advocate General, Punjab that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused to commit an offence of dacoity and in prosecution of common object of that assembly, he along with the co-accused had broken open the door of office of the complainant, had assaulted the complainant,

2025:PHHC:109662



looted a sum of Rs.15,50,000/- from the same and had fled away from the same. The complainant and other material witnesses are yet to be examined. There are chances of his intimidating the witnesses, absconding or committing similar offences if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused is alleged to have criminally trespassed in the business place of the complainant and assaulted him and his companions and robbed him/committed dacoity of an amount of Rs.15,50,000/- from his office. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The apprehension that he might intimidate the complainant and other eye-witnesses if released on bail, cannot be stated to be unfounded as they are yet to be examined. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case lest they prejudice the trial in any manner, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

21.08.2025
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No