



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

212

CRM-M-14414-2026

Date of decision : 20.03.2026

Date of uploading : 20.03.2026

Jeetpal Singh Alias Jitpal Singh @ VickyPetitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Anoop Singla, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.183 dated 19.12.2019 under Sections 379-B, 411, 34 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Badhani Kalan, District Moga.

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

“Statement of Manpreet Kumar, S/o Upinder Mandal, S/o Gobind Mandal, R/o Badhni Khurd, aged 21 years, mobile no. 9855132554 stated that I am resident of above mentioned address and is doing the work as a laborer and today on 19.12.2019 at about 06:30 PM in the evening I was going to my village Badhni Khurd after completing my labour work in the market of Badhni Kalan. Whence I reached the river bridge near Badhni Kalan on my Bicycle, I received a telephonic call of my brother and I put the phone on my ear, then three persons came on motor cycle and the person sitting between snatched my mobile phone. I also got hold of the persons sitting on the last seat. Then all the three persons started quarrelling with me. I identified all the three persons as they were resident of my nearby villages. The person driving the Motorcycle was Jaspal Singh @ Jassa son of Gurdeep Singh, the person sitting in between was Ajitpal Singh son of Nirmal Singh and the person sitting at the last was Harjinder Singh son of



Gurmail Singh, they all are resident of village Rania. They have snatched away my mobile make Samsung model A10S. I tried to obtain my mobile phone, which I have bought for Rs. 8500/-. The above named persons have snatched my mobile. I was coming to the police station Badhni Kalan for getting my information recorded then you met me on Nanka Gate main GT Road Badhni Kalan. I have given my statement to you and necessary action may be taken as per Law.sd/- Manpreet Kumar attested by Gurcharan Singh ASI, PS Badhni Kalan dated 19.12.2019.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that initially, the petitioner was arrested on 30.01.2020 and was released on bail vide order dated 17.04.2020 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga. However, he went to Rajasthan in search of his livelihood and became absent. Consequently, he was declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 15.12.2025 passed by the trial Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that thereafter, the petitioner was arrested on 21.01.2026 and since then he is in custody. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner is a young man aged about 29 years with no criminal antecedents. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised are serious in nature and thus the petitioner does not deserve the concession of the 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. Indubitably, the petitioner was arrested on 30.01.2020 and was released on bail vide order dated 17.04.2020 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga. Thereafter, owing to his absence from the Court



on 02.02.2023, non-bailable warrants were issued against him and ultimately, he was declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 15.12.2025 passed by the trial Court. The petitioner was re-arrested on 21.01.2026. Challan was presented on 13.01.2020. Total 16 prosecution witnesses have been cited out of which 3 have been examined and 11 have been given up till date. The rival contentions raised by learned counsel give rise to debatable issues which shall be ratiocinated upon 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 trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.1 As per custody certificate dated 18.03.2026 filed by learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 1 month and 25 days and is not shown to be involved in any other case.

Suffice to say, further detention of the petitioner as an undertrial is not warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. 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/Illaqa Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. 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.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

20.03.2026
jatin

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