



CRM-M-11698-2026

1

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

Sr. No.220

CRM-M-11698-2026
Date of Decision: 10.03.2026

GURDEEP SINGH ALIAS SONU**...Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present:- Mr. Sumeet Singh Brar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023 (akin to Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking grant of the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 24 dated 11.02.2019, registered under Section 61 of the Punjab Excise Act, 1914 at Police Station Doraha, District Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was granted regular bail in the present case on 19.03.2019. However, thereafter the petitioner could not appear before the trial Court and remained absent, on account of which he was declared a proclaimed person vide order dated 21.08.2025. It is further submitted that the petitioner challenged the said order before this Court and this Court vide interim order dated 28.01.2026 directed the petitioner to surrender before the learned trial Court within seven days, and the learned trial Court was directed to decide his bail application expeditiously, preferably within three days, subject to the petitioner depositing ₹1,00,000/- as costs with the Day Care Centre for



Elderly Disabled in Home for Old and Destitute People, Sector-15, Chandigarh. Learned counsel submits that in compliance with the said order, the petitioner deposited the aforesaid amount and surrendered before the learned trial Court. However, his prayer for grant of bail was not accepted by the learned trial Court and the Ld. Addl. Sessions Judge also declined to grant him bail, whereafter he was taken into custody. It is further submitted that the petitioner is in custody for the last about one month. Learned counsel has further argued that the co-accused, namely Gurdip Singh, has already been acquitted in the present case by the learned trial Court and, therefore, the petitioner also deserves the concession of regular bail.

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Hardeep Hans, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent–State and opposes the bail application on the ground that the petitioner had earlier been declared a proclaimed offender, and therefore he is not entitled to the concession of bail. It is further contended that there is every likelihood that the petitioner may again jump bail if released.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record. The petitioner has already complied with the order dated 28.01.2026 passed by this Court by depositing ₹1,00,000/- as costs with the concerned institution and by surrendering before the learned trial Court. It is also not disputed that one of the co-accused has already been acquitted in the present case. The petitioner is presently in custody for the last about one month. The petitioner has also undertaken to appear before the trial Court on



CRM-M-11698-2026 3

each and every date of hearing and to abide by the conditions imposed by the Court.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid circumstances, particularly the fact that the petitioner has complied with the directions issued by this Court, the acquittal of the co-accused and the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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