

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-9048-2026 in/&
CRA-D-301-2026
Date of Decision: 16.03.2026

PALVINDER SINGH @ DIMPLE
Versus
CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

...Appellant

...Respondent

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Ravi Kamal Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent-CBI.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (Oral)

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
FIR/RC No. 3(S)/2017 /CBI/SCB/CHG	09.01.2017	CBI, SCB, Chandigarh	120-B, 304 IPC, 3 , 4 & 5 OF Explosives Substance Act and 16 & 18 of Unlawful Activities (Prevention), Act 1967.

The present appeal has been filed by the appellant seeking grant of regular bail in case captioned above.

2 Counsel for the appellant submits that primary ground of appellant is parity with co-accused.

3 On the other hand, State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail on the grounds there is a criminal history of case under Section 302 IPC. It is further submitted that the bail application was earlier rejected and the appellant had approached the Hon’ble Supreme Court by way of SLP, which also came to be dismissed.

4 In answer to this, counsel for the appellant submits that he was granted bail and this case under Section 302 IPC is pending for last nine years. As such, pendency of the case cannot be a factor to deny bail. However, counsel for the State submits that appellant was arrested from Bangkok pursuant to a Red Corner Notice.

5 Counsel for the appellant submits that proceedings are going on against large number of accused and 81 witnesses were cited, out of them 27 have been examined and they undertake not to take any adjournment which is beyond their control. However, learned counsel submits that the trial is delayed by those accused who were on bail, their bail should be cancelled.

6 Although considering the period of custody, we are inclined to grant the bail but the previous conduct of the appellant is a big hurdle as he was arrested with red corner notice from Bangkok after much efforts and he is a flight risk.

7 Given above, the appeal is dismissed with a request to the trial Court to expedite the trial. It is further clarified that those accused who were on bail, if they remain absent, their bail shall be cancelled. It is further clarified that if the trial is not completed by 31st December, 2026, it shall be permissible for the appellant to file an application for bail before trial Court on the ground of prolonged custody and trial Court shall consider the same without being influenced by the earlier rejection. All pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

16.03.2026
jyoti3

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