

240

CRM-M-4576-2026

-1-



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-4576-2026

Date of decision: 02.04.2026

MANGAT SINGH ALIAS MANGA SINGHPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Chahit Bansal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, DAG Punjab.

.....

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.86 dated 31.05.2025 registered under Sections 132, 221, 126(2), 121(2), 115(2), 351(2), 3(5) BNS, 2023 (Section 238 BNS added later on) at Police Station City 2 Mansa, District Mansa.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that the petitioner along with the other co-accused persons snatched the bag of the complainant filled with cash and tickets and gave injuries to the complainant with broken glass bottle.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the alleged incident. He argued that the petitioner was arrested on 31.05.2025 and no recovery is to be effected from him. He submitted that



even if the prosecution version is believed to be true, then also, the injuries of the victim have been declared simple in nature. He has further argued that similarly placed co-accused have already been granted concession of bail by learned Trial Court. The petitioner has clean antecedents. He further submits that investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of 17 prosecution witnesses none has been examined. On the strength of above arguments, he prays that no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, has filed the custody certificate and status report, which are taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. However, he has not controverted the fact that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 10 months; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges have been framed and out of 17 prosecution witnesses none has been examined; co-accused has already been granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court as well as learned Trial Court; the complicity of the petitioner can only be determined after conclusion of the trial which may take long time to conclude. As such, no useful purpose would be served by detaining her in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future



would be violative of her rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

7. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

02.04.2026

puneet

- i) Whether speaking/reasoned?
- ii) Whether reportable?

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No