



CRM-M-3346-2026 (O&M) -1-

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

233

**CRM-M-3346-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 20.04.2026**

HARDEEP SINGH @ DEEPU

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Esh Gupta, Advocate with
Ms. Sarika Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023 seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No.74 dated 18.06.2025 under Sections 61(2), 249, 253, 309(4) of BNS by the police vide GD No.029 dated 26.06.2025 (Annexure P-2) (Sections 25-54-59 of Arms Act added vide GD No.38 dated 26.06.2025), registered at Police Station Chhabbewal, District Hoshiarpur.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the present case was registered on the basis of statement of complainant, namely Bandna Jaswal, while stating that she is running Simran Enterprises Money Exchange. On 18.6.2025, at about 11:00 AM, she left her shop to go to her house as relatives were visiting, leaving behind Mandeep Kaur, Manisha and Khushdeep at the shop. Thereafter, at about 01:56 PM, Mandeep Kaur (the girl working at her shop) called her and informed her



regarding robbery committed at the shop. Upon reaching the shop, the complainant was informed by employees that three boys with muffled faces entered the shop and removed Rs. 2,50,000/- from the drawer by showing weapon like pistol and fled from the spot. During investigation, the present petitioner was arrested in this case on 26.06.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner has been nominated in the present case, on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused namely, Harpreet Singh @ Happy which is inadmissible in the eyes of law; there is no incriminating evidence against the present petitioner to connect him with the alleged offence; the petitioner is involved in 01 more case under the NDPS Act, 1985 and he is on bail in that case; the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 09 months; therefore, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars as he is not required for recovery purposes; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and as such, prayed for concession of regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State, and by way of filing of custody certificate dated 19.04.2026 and reply dated 17.04.2026, opposed the concession of regular bail to the petitioner and submitted that at the house of co-accused Jaswinder Singh @ Mango, a conspiracy was hatched to commit robbery and the present petitioner supplied pistol to



the co-accused; the petitioner alongwith his co-accused committed the robbery from the shop of the complainant by showing pistol.

On a query posed by this Court that as to whether the petitioner was present at the spot of crime, it is submitted that the petitioner was not present at the time of committing robbery and supplied the weapon. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and is involved in 01 more case, however he is on bail in that case; investigation in the present case has been completed and challan stands presented on 25.07.2025; the petitioner has been in custody for a period of 09 months & 21 days and as such, prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

6. Heard.

7. Taking into consideration the facts & circumstances of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties and the role assigned to the present petitioner that he supplied the weapon to the co-accused to commit robbery; investigation is complete & challan stands presented; the petitioner is stated to be involved in one more case and he is on bail in that case; the present petitioner is in custody for last more than 09 months; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, and it is a trite principle of



criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. 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 bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. Nothing observed herein shall be construed as an opinion on the merits of the main case.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

20.04.2026

Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO