

2026:PHHC:078042



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

220 CRM-M No.7813 of 2026
Date of Decision: 18.05.2026

Jaspreet Singh @ Jarman ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sukhwinder S.Aviraj Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
297	03.12.2025	City Gurdaspur, District Gurdaspur	109, 304(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Harpreet Singh alleging therein that he was working as a driver with Verka Milk Plant and used to drive a tanker. On 03.12.2025, he was about to leave for his house after performing duty at about 7 PM and had come out of the Verka Milk Plant to drive his own Zen car when three youths while riding on a motorbike

2026:PHHC:078042



came from vegetable market side. Their faces were covered. They encircled his car. One of them took out a pistol and fired with the same on the ground thereby making him scared. He opened the window pane of his car and tried to flee but one of them fired shot with his firearm towards him. Thereafter they took away his car and fled with the same. His mobile phone was also kept in his vehicle.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On 10.12.2025, the petitioner was apprehended on the basis of a secret information. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime. On the basis of the same, the co-accused Sukhbir Singh @ Sukh and Jagroop Singh @ Jupa were nominated as accused. Accused Jagroop Singh @ Jupa was arrested on 09.02.2026. Accused Sukhbir Singh has dead. The car of the complainant was recovered in another bearing FIR No.281 dated 07.12.2025 registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran. The investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR. He is in custody since 10.12.2025. The complainant did not receive any injury at his hands nor he identified him as one of the persons who had snatched his car or had fired shot upon him. The complainant had not sustained any injury in the occurrence. He was apprehended only on the basis of a secret information. The disclosure statement allegedly suffered by him cannot be considered to be legally admissible in evidence. His involvement in another case can also not be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to

2026:PHHC:078042



him. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have made an attempt to kill the complainant by firing shots with a firearm upon him and is further alleged to have robbed him of his vehicle as well as his cell phone. The allegations make out a prima facie for commission of subject offences against him. However, he has been in custody since 10.12.2025. The trial will take time to conclude since even charges have not been framed so far. No fruitful purpose would be served by his continued detention. The well settled proposition of law is that bail is the rule and jail is an exception. Pre trial incarceration of an accused should not be a replica of post conviction sentencing. The detention prior to trial should not become punitive. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

18.05.2026
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No