



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

128

CRM-M-15256-2025 (O&M)
Decided on : 16.03.2026

Bhupinder Singh @ Bhupi Rana . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Ashish Partap Undir, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Bhupinder Singh @ Bhupi Rana	59	24.07.2018	392, 382, 384, 473, 506, 148, 149, 120-B of IPC, 1860, 25 of Arms Act, 1959 and 18, 22, 29 of NDPs Act, 1985	Sadar Rajpura	Patiala

2. Based on secret information received from an informant, impugned FIR has been registered against several individuals alleged to be part of a large gang involved in highway robberies. The gang is reportedly active during nighttime and is known to use stolen vehicles with forged number plates to carry out their criminal activities. Notably, the FIR has been lodged without any actual recovery or raid being conducted at the alleged locations. The individuals named in the FIR are, (1) Sukhpreet Singh



@ Bhuda, (2) Amna Jaito, (3) Arshdeep Singh @ Bittu, (4) Varinder Pal Singh @ Beena, (5) Palwinder Singh @ Lakhari, (6) Alam Battal @ Kranti, (7) Harman Randhawa, (8) Lucky Patiala, (9) Binda, (10) Bhupi Rana, (11) Deep Sahni, along with three unknown accomplices.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by the prosecuting agency, as on the day when the secret information was received, the FIR was registered, and even at the time when the raid was conducted, petitioner was already confined in jail in another case, i.e., FIR No.08 dated 14.01.2017 registered at Police Station City Jagadhari, District Yamuna Nagar.

It is further submitted that during the alleged raid only five accused persons were arrested, namely, (i) Aman Kumar @ Aman Jaito, (ii) Raj Kumar @ Shaffy, (iii) Sukha @ Vicky, (iv) Karan Mangla @ Karan, and (v) Sumit Bajaj @ Landi.

Petitioner was subsequently produced before the trial Court through production warrants while he was already in custody in the aforesaid case.

It is further admitted position of both the sides that co-accused, who were arrested from the spot have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Bench of this Court & details of such cases are namely:

- I. Aman Kumar @ Aman Jaito – order dated 16.09.2024, passed in CRM-M-22012-2024 (P-3);
- II. Karan Mangla – order dated 27.11.2018, passed in CRM-M-51037-2018 (P-6);
- III. Sukha @ Vicky – order dated 07.12.2018, passed in CRM-M-



- 53258-2018 (P-7);
- IV. Sumit Bajaj @ Laddi – order dated 20.02.2019, passed in CRM-M-52860-2018 (O&M) (P-9) and;
- V. Raj Kumar @ Shaffy – order dated 20.02.2019, passed in CRM-M-53519-2018 (O&M) (P-10).

It is further submitted that petitioner is in custody in the present case for a period of 02 years, 02 months and 27 days. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case as well as the fact that the co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail, petitioner seeks grant of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate dated 14.03.2026, in Court, which is taken on record. Copy there of has been handed over to the opposite counsel.
5. Learned State counsel while opposing the prayer for bail submits that apart the present case, petitioner is involved in several other cases under the different provisions of criminal law. Thus, simply keeping in view the antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve any leniency, and accordingly, prays for dismissal of instant regular bail petition.
6. In response to above, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in 12 of the cases, petitioner has either been acquitted or released on bail. The details of such cases are as under:-

Sr. No.	Case details	Status
1	FIR No.185, dated 02.06.2019, P.S. Naraingarh, Distt. Ambala	Acquitted on 04.03.2022
2	FIR No.89, dated 16.04.2018, P.S. Chandimandir, Distt. Panchkula	Acquitted on 19.03.2023
3	FIR No.195, dated 02.06.2018, P.S. Chandimandir, Distt. Panchkula	Acquitted on 17.03.2021
4	FIR No.172, dated 28.04.2019, P.S.	Acquitted on 05.10.2023



	<i>Baldev Nagar, Distt. Ambala</i>	
5	<i>FIR No.127, dated 02.06.2015, P.S. Naraingarh, Distt. Ambala</i>	<i>Acquitted on 03.06.2016</i>
6	<i>FIR No.29, dated 11.05.2019, P.S. Naya Gaon, Distt. SAS Nagar</i>	<i>On bail dated 11.09.2023</i>
7	<i>FIR No.938, dated 10.08.2018, P.S. Jagadhari, Distt. Yamuna Nagar</i>	<i>Conviction undergone on 03.05.2019</i>
8	<i>FIR No. 581, dated 13.11.2017, P.S. Sadar Thanesar, Distt. Kurukshetra</i>	<i>Acquitted on 27.08.2025</i>
9	<i>FIR No.155, dated 13.04.2018, P.S. Ambala Cantt. Distt. Ambala</i>	<i>Acquitted on 28.11.2024</i>
10	<i>FIR No.08, dated 04.01.2017, P.S. Jagadhari, Distt. Yamuna Nagar</i>	<i>Conviction undergone</i>
11	<i>FIR No.169, dated 30.03.2023, P.S. Parao, Distt. Ambala</i>	<i>On bail, dated 29.04.2025</i>
12	<i>FIR No.104, dated 25.03.2021, P.S. Ambala City, Distt. Ambala</i>	<i>Pending</i>

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the material available on record, it emerges that petitioner is inside jail in the present case for a custody period of 02 years, 02 months and 27 days, as per the custody certificate placed on record. It has also been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioner that at the time when the alleged secret information was received and the FIR in question came to be registered, petitioner was already confined in jail in another case and was subsequently produced before the trial Court through production warrants.

It has further been submitted that some of the co-accused arrested during the course of the raid have already been granted the concession of regular bail. Although learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail by referring to the criminal antecedents of the petitioner, learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that in several cases the petitioner has either been acquitted or released on bail.

8. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case and



considering the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner as well as the totality of the circumstances noticed here-above, this Court is of the view that further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose.

Consequently, the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here-above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

11. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

12. Petition stands **disposed of**.
Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 16, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No