



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana at
Chandigarh**

247

CRM-M-9118-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 08.04.2026

Sukhbir Singh	... Petitioner
Versus	
State of Punjab	... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Navinder Jit Singh Dandiwal, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. J.S. Mahel, Advocate for the complainant.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the 2nd petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.126 dated 05.09.2023, registered under Sections 420 and 34 of IPC, at Police Station Chattiwind, District Amritsar.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the allegations against the present petitioner pertains to receipt of an amount of Rs.6,50,000/- from the account of co-accused Joga Singh and not from the complainant namely Amardeep Sing. It is submitted that the said amount has already been returned by the petitioner, and in support thereof, the bank statement has been placed on record as Annexure P-2. It is further contended that the petitioner has been in custody for the last four months and the investigation qua the present petitioner stands completed. Learned counsel submits that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. It is further submitted that the present petitioner is suffering from various health ailments, also suffereing



CRM-M-9118-2026 (O&M) (2)

from chronic heart disease and his medical record has been annexed as Annexure P-3. Thus, the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that investigation has been completed; challan has already been presented on 02.02.2026; present petitioner is in custody since 11.12.2025, and two of the other co-accused are yet to be arrested.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant submitted that an amount of Rs.20,00,000/- was paid by the complainant to the petitioner and the co-accused persons. It is further contended that the co-accused persons are yet to be arrested. However, it is not disputed that the petitioner has already returned an amount of Rs.6,50,000/- to the complainant.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and without commenting upon the merits of the case, the petitioner has been in custody since 11.12.2025, i.e. for the last four months; investigation qua him stands completed; challan has already been presented; trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude; it is also not in dispute that a sum of Rs.6,50,000/- has already been returned by the petitioner, and that the petitioner is stated to be suffering from chronic heart disease, 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 and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception,

CRM-M-9118-2026 (O&M) (3)

this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. 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.

08.04.2026

Geeta

Whether speaking /reasoned

Whether Reportable

Yes / No

Yes / No

(SUBHAS MEHLA)

JUDGE