

219

CRM-M-14472-2026 (O&M)

-1-



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-14472-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 13.05.2026

SANDEEP SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present:- Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through V.C.)

Mr. Amritpal Singh Gill, DAG Punjab.

.....
RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J. (ORAL)

CRM-11961-2026

Keeping in view the averments made in the application, the document is taken on record as Annexure A-1 subject to all just exceptions. Exemption is granted as prayed for.

Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

Disposed of.

Main Case

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.209 dated 30.11.2025 registered under Sections 109, 115(2), 303(2), 191(3), 238, 190 of BNS, 2023 at Police Station City-1, Sangrur, District Sangrur.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that the petitioner along with the other co-accused snatched the mobile of the complainant and fled from the spot and when the complainant chased him and



asked to return his mobile, he along with co-accused attacked him and gave multiple injuries with an intention to kill him. Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and he has no concern with the alleged incident. He argued that the petitioner is in custody since 06.01.2026 and no recovery is effected from him. He submitted that even if the prosecution version is believed to be true, then also, except one injury all other injuries on the person of the complainant have been declared simple in nature. He has further argued that similarly placed co-accused has already been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 30.03.2026 passed in *CRM-M-4614-2026*. He further submits that investigation is complete; challan stands presented; however, charges have not yet been framed. On the strength of above arguments, he prays that no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, has filed the custody certificate and status report, which are taken on record. Costs imposed vide previous order dated 22.04.2026 has been duly deposited. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature. However, he submits and fairly accepted that the injuries attributed to the petitioner in para 7 of reply is incorrect and the petitioner has been attributed injury No.20 and 21 only which has been declared simple in nature. He further submits that there are two other cases registered against the petitioner meaning thereby he is a habitual offender.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after

perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody



for the last more than 04 months; investigation is complete; challan stands presented; however, charges have not yet been framed; co-accused has already been granted bail by this Court; the injury attributed to the petitioner has been declared simple in nature; the complicity of the petitioner can only be determined after conclusion of the trial which may take long time to conclude. As such, no useful purpose would be served by detaining him in further custody. His continued detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of his rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

6. Reliance is placed upon a judgment in the case of ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, wherein Hon'ble Apex Court has held that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle "*bail is a rule*" and "*jail is an exception*".

7. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the



role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

13.05.2026
puneet

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

i)	Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
ii)	Whether reportable?	Yes/No