



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

218

CRM-M-51538-2024
Decided on : 08.05.2025

Jagdeep Singh @ Deepa . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Balwant Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, 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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jagdeep Singh @ Deepa	32	29.03.2024	392 & 397 of IPC (Sections 379-B, 323, 201, 411 & 120-B of IPC added later on)	City Morinda	Rupnagar

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that initial version i.e. FIR was got lodged at the instance of Sandeep Singh, claiming to be an employee in Airtel office in Morinda, who stated that while going to deposit the amount in the Axis Bank, some unknown persons gave him beatings on the right hand with ‘Daat’ and stole an amount of Rs.1,15,000/- from him. The alleged looters were covering their faces with some cloth.

3. Learned counsel while referring to the final report under Section 173 Cr.P.C., more particularly referred to the statement of Rohit



Kumar s/o Ram Pal, which was got recorded next day, wherein, it is mentioned that he went to make deposit in the *ATM machine of Axis Bank Morinda, some unknown men stole Rs.1,44,000/- from him by attacking him with sharp weapon.* Apart difference in the amount, in the initial statement of Sandeep Singh, it has not come anywhere that, Rohit was accompanying him and similar factor can be noticed from the statement of Rohit Kumar, who has not revealed about the name of Sandeep Singh.

Counsel also argues that petitioner was arrested on 30.03.2024, and thereupon, prosecution has shown the recovery of a motorcycle only, and the cash amount had already been recovered from the co-accused Maninder Singh @ Debi.

4. Learned counsel further points out that, as per the investigation report, the petitioner's name, and also of the other co-accused, has been implicated solely on the basis of assumptions of the complainant. Furthermore, no substantive investigation was conducted by the police to search out the real accused and to verify the facts in complaint. As a result, the petitioner's involvement appears to be entirely fake, malicious and motivated. Besides, petitioner is never found involved in any similar cases, and his continued incarceration would serve no meaningful purpose for the prosecution.

In addition, learned counsel also submits that one of the co-accused i.e. Varinder Singh alias Gola (who is on the similar footings), has been granted concession of regular bail by the coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 17.01.2025, passed in CRM-M-58093-2024, titled as, "Varinder Singh alias Gola v. State of Punjab". In support of his contention,



learned counsel has filed the copy of order dated 17.01.2025, in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

In view of above, claiming parity, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel also does not dispute the factual position addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, as recorded here-above.

6. Be that as it may, I have carefully considered the submissions from both the sides. Without making any observations regarding the quality or standard of evidence upon which the prosecution seeks to build up its case, I take note of the fact that the petitioner has been in custody for more than one year and one month. Additionally, it is also observed that despite submission of the challan and framing of charges, the process of recording of evidence is yet to commence.

In the given circumstances, I find it appropriate to entertain the petitioner's plea for regular bail, as it pertains to the fundamental question of an individual's liberty. Furthermore, plea of the petitioner finds support from the fact that similarly situated co-accused, 'Varinder Singh alias Gola', has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court.

7. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition 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.

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



or indirectly.

9. The observation made here-in-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.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

MAY 08, 2025

J.Ram

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable:</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>