

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-33243-2025
Reserved on: 09.09.2025
Pronounced on: 17.09.2025

Varinder Singh @ Vimpy

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sahil Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section
61	29.03.2025	Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda	111 of BNS

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above had come up before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.

2. As per paragraph 8 of the bail petition and as per paragraph 11 D of the status report/custody certificate the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Dated	Offenses	Police Station
1.	10	24.01.2011	307, 506 IPC & 25 of Arms Act	Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda
2.	204	08.08.2018	25 of Arms Act	Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda
3.	243	12.08.2019	25 of Arms Act	Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda
4.	66	27.04.2021	21B of NDPS Act	Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda
5.	23	02.02.2023	25 of Arms Act	Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda
6.	234	29.10.2023	21A of NDPS Act	Talwandi Sabo, Distt. Bathinda
7.	21	01.02.2014	25 of Arms Act	Talwandi Sabo
8.	40	12.11.2011	25 of Arms Act	Women Cell
9.	14	08.08.2010	25 of Arms Act	Talwandi Sabo
10.	78	28.07.2009	25 of Arms Act, 336, 34 IPC	Talwandi Sabo
11.	93	15.09.2009	25 of Arms Act	Talwandi Sabo
12.	113	03.08.2010	25 of Arms Act	Talwandi Sabo

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the status report filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“4. That in compliance of the order of Hon'ble High Court, the status of present case FIR was called from Station House Officer, Police Station

Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, which was submitted vide Letter No.2109/5A PS Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda Dated 23.07.2025 and after careful perusal, it has been ascertained that, on dated 29.03.2025, ASI Randhawa Singh 1124/Bathinda along with ASI Desh Raj 52/Bathinda, LSC Gagandeep Kaur 1926, PHG Harbans Singh 22431, PHG Gurcharan Singh 22138 and a laptop printer operated by ASI Desh Raj 52/Bathinda, on private vehicle driven by him, were present Near Dashmesh School Canal Bridge for patrolling and checking of suspected persons. Then at around 07:30 AM, secret informer personally came before ASI Randhawa Singh and informed him that accused/petitioner Varinder Singh alias Vimpy Son of Puran Singh resident of Natt Road, Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Jaskaran Singh alias Gosha Son of Gurjant Singh resident of Village Bhagiwandar, District Bathinda and Varinder Singh alias Bindri Son of Naib Singh resident of Village Mahinangal, District Bathinda are addicted to selling drugs and against whom several cases have been registered for selling drugs and committing crimes being armed with deadly weapons. They can still be caught on Natt Road armed with their deadly weapons while robbing passersby persons. 5. That on the basis above said solid and reliable information, ASI Randhawa Singh had found the offence under Section 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 against accused/petitioner Varinder Singh alias Vimpy Son of Puran Singh resident of Natt Road, Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda, Jaskaran Singh alias Gosha Son of Gurjant Singh alias Bindri Son of Naib Singh resident of Village Mahinangal, District Bathinda. Therefore, the present case FIR No.61 Dated 29.03.2025 under Section 111 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 was registered at PS Talwandi Sabo, District Bathinda against above said accused/petitioner Varinder Singh alias Vimpy, Jaskaran Singh alias Gosha and Varinder Singh alias Bindri.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and his family.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial quantity, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the status report.

7. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which reads as follows:

*“11 B. The evidence against the petitioner
It is submitted that the first and foremost evidence against the petitioner Varinder Singh @ Vimpy is solid and reliable secret information and then the recovery of deadly weapon 'sharp edged khanda sep' fitted in wooden*

handle on the spot effected from him.

C. The role of the petitioner

It is submitted that accused/petitioner Varinder Singh @ Vimpy along with his co-accused persons while armed with deadly weapons addicted to consuming drugs, habitual offenders and on dated 29.03.2025, the accused/petitioner along with his associates while armed with deadly weapons robbing passers-by persons on Natt Road, Talwandi Sabo.”

REASONING:

8. There is sufficient prima facie evidence connecting the petitioner with the alleged crime. However, pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing.

9. As per paragraph 5 of the bail petition, the petitioner has been in custody since 29.03.2025. As per the custody certificate dated 08.09.2025, the petitioner's total custody in this FIR is 05 months and 09 days.

10. The law of bail, like any other branch of law, has its own philosophy, and occupies an important place in the administration of justice and the concept of bail emerges from the conflict between the police power to restrict liberty of a man who is alleged to have committed a crime, and presumption of innocence in favour of the alleged criminal.¹ In deciding bail applications an important factor which should certainly be taken into consideration by the Court is the delay in concluding the trial.—Often this takes several years, and if the accused is denied bail but is ultimately acquitted, who will restore so many years of his life spent in custody? —Is Article 21 of the Constitution, which is the most basic of all the fundamental rights in our Constitution, not violated in such a case? —Of course this is not the only factor, but it is certainly one of the important factors in deciding whether to grant bail.² Personal liberty is a very precious fundamental right and it should be curtailed only when it becomes imperative according to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case.³ Personal liberty deprived when bail is refused, is too precious a value of our constitutional system recognised under Art. 21 that the curial power to negate it is a great trust exercisable, not casually, but judicially with lively concern for the cost to the individual and the community.⁴ When the undertrial prisoners are detained in jail custody to an indefinite period, Article 21 of the Constitution is violated.⁵

11. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked viz-a-viz pre-trial custody, coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, and the other factors peculiar to

¹ Supreme Court of India in Vaman Narain Ghiya v. state of Rajasthan, [E-SCR] ; [2008] 17 SCR 369, Para 16, decided on 12.12.2008.

² Supreme Court of India in State of Kerala v. Raneef, SC 2J [E-SCR]; [2011] 1 SCR 590, Para 4, decided on 03.01.2011.

³ Supreme Court of India in Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre v. State of Maharashtra, SC 2J [E-SCR], Paragraph 127, decided on 02.12.2010.

⁴ Supreme Court of India in Babu Singh & ors v. State of UP, [E-SCR] P. 777, decided on 31.01.1978.

⁵ Supreme Court of India in Sanjay Chandra v. CBI , [2011] 13 (ADDL.) S.C.R. 309, Para 26, [E-SCR], decided on 23.11.2011.

this case, there would be no justifiability for further pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

12. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

13. Given the above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above, subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate or duty Magistrate, with or without sureties, with a maximum bond amount not to exceed INR 10,000.

14. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, the surety is capable of producing the accused. However, instead of surety, the petitioner may provide a fixed deposit of INR 10,000/-, with a clause that the interest shall not be accumulated in FD, either drawn from a State-owned bank or any bank listed on the National Stock Exchange and/or Bombay Stock Exchange, in favour of the “Chief Judicial Magistrate” of the concerned Sessions Division; or a fixed deposit made in the name of the petitioner, with similar terms and with endorsement from the banker stating that the FD shall not be encumbered or redeemed without the permission of the concerned trial Court, or until the surety bond has been discharged.

15. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

16. This order is subject to the petitioner’s complying with the following terms.

17. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case, or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

18. Given the background of allegations against the petitioner, it becomes paramount to protect the members of society, complainant and incapacitating the accused would be one of the primary options until the filing of the closure report or discharge, or acquittal. Consequently, it would be appropriate to restrict the possession of firearms. [This restriction is being imposed based on the preponderance of the evidence of probability

and not of evidence of certainty, i.e., beyond a reasonable doubt; and as such, it is not to be construed as an intermediate sanction]. Given the nature of the allegations and the other circumstances peculiar to this case, the petitioner shall surrender all weapons, firearms, and ammunition, if any, along with the arms license to the concerned authority within fifteen days of release from prison and inform the Investigator of the compliance. However, subject to the Indian Arms Act, 1959, the petitioner shall be entitled to renew and reclaim them in case of acquittal in this case, provided otherwise permissible under the concerned rules. Restricting firearms would instill confidence in the victim(s), their families, and society; it would also restrain the accused from influencing the witnesses and repeating the offense.

19. The conditions mentioned above imposed by this court are to endeavor to reform and ensure the accused does not repeat the offense and also to block the menace of drug abuse. In *Mohammed Zubair v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2022:INSC:735 [Para 28], Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 279 of 2022, Para 29, decided on July 20, 2022, A Three-Judge bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that "The bail conditions imposed by the Court must not only have a nexus to the purpose that they seek to serve but must also be proportional to the purpose of imposing them. The courts, while imposing bail conditions must balance the liberty of the accused and the necessity of a fair trial. While doing so, conditions that would result in the deprivation of rights and liberties must be eschewed."

20. In *Md. Tajiur Rahaman v. The State of West Bengal*, decided on 08-Nov-2024, SLP (Crl) 12225-2024, the Hon'ble Supreme Court holds in Para 7, "It goes without saying that if the petitioner is found involved in such like offence in future, the concession of bail granted to him today will liable to be withdrawn and the petitioner is bound to face the necessary consequences."

21. The significant consideration for granting bail is that the Court aims to give the petitioner another chance to course-correct, reform, and reintegrate into the community as an ideal citizen. To ensure that the petitioner also abides by the assurance made on the petitioner's behalf by not repeating the offence or indulging in any crime, it shall be desirable to impose the following additional condition.

22. This bail is conditional, with the foundational condition being that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, or commits any offence under the NDPS Act, where the quantity involved is more than half of the intermediate, or commercial, or violates S. 19, or 24, or 27-A of the NDPS Act, the State shall file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and as per their discretion, they may cancel this bail.

23. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

24. In *Amit Rana v. State of Haryana*, CRM-18469-2025 [Decided on 05.08.2025], in CRA-D-123-2020], a Division Bench of Punjab and Haryana High Court in paragraph 13, holds that “To ensure that every person in judicial custody who has been granted bail or whose sentence has been suspended gets back their liberty without any delay, it is appropriate that whenever the bail order or the orders of suspension of sentence are not immediately sent by the Registry, computer systems, or Public Prosecutor, then in such a situation, to facilitate the immediate restoration of the liberty granted by any Court, the downloaded copies of all such orders, subject to verification, must be accepted by the Court before whom the bail bonds are furnished.”

25. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

17.09.2025
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.