

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

2026:PHHC:048247



124

CRM-M-14313-2026
Date of decision: 27.03.2026
Date of uploading: 27.03.2026

Deepak Kumar @ Deepak Suri

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Aayushi, Advocate for
Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 29 dated 15.03.2025 registered under section (318(4) of BNS 420 of IPC), (319(2) of BNS 419 of IPC), (336(2) of BNS 465 of IPC), (336(3) of BNS 468 of IPC), (338 of BNS 467 of IPC), (340(2) of BNS 471 of IPC), (61(2) (120-B of IPC) (Section 38 BNS 100 of IPC added lateron) at P.S. Civil Lines, Amritsar.

2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out by the petitioner in the present petition) is as follows:-

“IN The Court of Sh. Parinder Singh ASJ, Amritsar Endst No. 331 Dated 10/03/2025. In the Court of Sh. Parinder Singh ASJ, Amritsar FIR NO. 113/2024 PS Kamboj ASR. COPY OF ORDER, 497 State Vs. Jatinder Singh alias Babba & another. CNR No. PBAS010162102024 NDPS No.497 of 2024 Present: Sh. Sukhjinder Singh, Addl PP for the State. Accused Jatinder Singh alias Babba and Rajwinder Singh @ Bhindu absent. Non bailable warrants of accused Rajwinder Singh @ Bhindu and Jatinder Singh alias Babba received back unexecuted. Upon Issuance of notice, sureties Amrinder Singh and Milkha Singh appeared through their respective Counsels. As submitted by Amrinder Singh, who is present in person in the Court, he does not know any such Jatinder Singh alias Baba and signatures appearing on bail bonds are not his genuine signatures. Similar statement has been suffered by Milkha Singh, as per which he even does not know any such Rajwinder Singh @ Bhindu. It appears that on behalf of accused, some persons impersonating as Amrinder Singh and Milkha Singh have furnished fake surety bonds. The matter needs to be thoroughly investigated so as to find out that who else was involved with said impersonators. Accordingly, necessary direction be issued to Station in use Officer of PS Civil Lines. Amritsar to register FIR against the beneficiaries namely Jatinder Singh alias Babba and Rajwinder Singh @ Bhindu as well as impersonators, their identifiers and all other persons, who may be found involved in the same. Copy of the bonds along with all the documents accompanying the same, application moved on behalf of accused for furnishing bail bonds and statements of Amrinder Singh and Milkha Singh recorded today in the Court be forwarded to the Station House Officer with a direction to intimate this Court within a period of one week after registering formal FIR Fresh non bailable warrants of arrest of both the accused be issued again for 25.04.2025. In view of the order dated 08.11.2024 passed by Hon'ble High Court in CRM-M-53637-2024 (O&M), accused Tarandeep Singh is ordered to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds in the sum of Rs. 50,000/- with one surety in like

amount. Bail bonds surety bonds furnished, which are accepted and attested, Supplementary police report qua accused Tarandeep Singh has already been presented Same is ordered to be attached with the present case Typed by Avadh Joshi STENOGRAPHER Gd-II, SD/- (Parinder Singh) Additional Sessions Judge/ASR/28.02.2025 UID No. PB0247 Enclosed Related Docs (9 Pages). Copy of Order forwarded to the SHO PS Civil Lines Amritsar for information and necessary action.”

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 02.11.2025. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that, upon culmination of investigation, challan stands presented against the petitioner on 30.01.2026, which is primarily based on documentary evidence. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has further submitted that the trial emanating from the FIR in question is a magisterial one and the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for more than 4 months. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and, thus, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 18.03.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 02.11.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan was presented on 30.01.2026. Total 19 prosecution have been cited and it is the conceded position before this Court that none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined till

date. It is not in dispute that conclusion of trial will take long time. It is also not in dispute before this Court that trial emanating from the FIR in question is a Magisterial one. The rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties; as to the whether the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR, shall be gone into during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage lest it may prejudice the rights of either of the parties. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the remaining prosecution evidence.

7. As per the custody certificate dated 18.03.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for 4 months & 14 days and is stated to be involved in one more FIR/case of similar offences. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of ***Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477*** & judgments of this Court in ***CRM-M No.38822-2022*** titled as ***Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana***, decided on 29.11.2021, and ***Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191***.

Suffice to say, the further detention of the petitioner in custody is not required in the facts and circumstances of the case.

8. In view of above, the petition in hand is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqha Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

9. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

10. Ordered accordingly.

11. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
12. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

March 27, 2026		(SUMEET GOEL)
Naveen		JUDGE
	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable:	Yes/No