



**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH**

219

CRM-M-67763-2025
Date of Decision: 05.12.2025

JITENDERPAL SINGH @ JITENDRA PAL SINGH

... Petitioner

VERSUS**STATE OF PUNJAB**

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.********

Present: Mr. Ranjit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Hans, DAG, Punjab.

**********H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)**

This petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.223 dated 07.10.2024 under Sections 318(4) of BNS, Section 66-D of Information and Technology Act (Section 61(2) BNS added later on) registered at Police Station City Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he alongwith some unknown persons, pretending to be the officials of C.B.I., duped the complainant for Rs.44 lacs and got the money transferred to his own account.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he had immediately made complaint to the Superintendent of Police, Bareilly regarding the misuse of his account. He further submits that an online complaint was made on the portal of Grievance Cell and a private complaint was also moved by him in this regard. Counsel further argues that infact the petitioner himself is a

victim of the crime as his account has been misused. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 months and 17 days. The trial of the case is yet to be commenced and the same is likely to take a long time to conclude. Hence, the counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rohit Hans, DAG, Punjab accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail and has filed the custody certificate dated 04.12.2025 in the Court today, which is taken on record. He further submits that as per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 months and 17 days in the present case. He further submits that there is active role of the petitioner in the commission of the offence in question. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Undoubtedly, the allegations against the petitioner are serious. However, the learned State Counsel is not in a position to deny that the petitioner is in custody for the last 02 months and 17 days. It is also noticeable that charges against the petitioner have not yet been framed and as such, the trial of the case may take a long time to conclude. Otherwise also, the petitioner is not involved in any other case and is not required for any custodial interrogation. Moreover, speedy trial is a material right of an accused, which could not be infringed and he cannot be kept behind bars for long, especially when his guilt is yet to be proved in accordance with law. Hence, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner has already undergone custody of 02 months and 17 days and the trial is yet to commence, which may take a long time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.
9. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.
10. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.
11. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

DECEMBER 05, 2025.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No