



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

**CRM-M-18474-2026
Date of decision: 20.04.2026**

SANDEEP SINGH ALIAS GAGGI

...PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. S.K. Sirsa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case bearing FIR No.77 dated 19.06.2025 registered under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 111 and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Post Division 4, Police Station Lahori Gate, District Patiala.

2. Brief stated, on 19.06.2025, ASI Prem Chand received a secret information to the effect that petitioner and other co-accused are facilitating the persons confined in jail, by providing fake sureties at the time of furnishing bail bonds etc. or by appearing themselves before the Courts concerned, while furnishing fake bail bonds and sureties. Hence, the FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely involved in the present case as no offence under Section 111 of BNS is made out against the petitioner; the case of the petitioner is on same



footing with co-accused, namely, Kulwinder Singh @ Rohit, Vikram Kumar, Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi, Renu Kant and Hakam Singh, who have already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide a common order dated 10.03.2026 passed in **CRM-M Nos.67300, 69519, 71225, 71584 & 71645** (Annexure P-4); there is nothing on record to show that the petitioner had arranged any fake document for the purpose of commission of alleged offence; nothing has been recovered from the petitioner during investigation; petitioner is in custody for the last about 10 months; the petitioner is having clear and clean antecedents and he is not involved in any other case; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind the bars. As such, learned counsel prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He opposed the contentions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by submitting that the petitioner is member of a gang, who is involved in illegal activities. However, it is not disputed that the petitioner is in custody for the last 09 months and 25 days and that the case of the petitioner is on same footing with co-accused, namely, Kulwinder Singh @ Rohit, Vikram Kumar, Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi, Renu Kant and Hakam Singh, who have already been granted the concession of regular bail.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case and the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties that the petitioner is in custody for the last 09 months and 25 days; except the present one, the petitioner is not involved in any other case and is having clean and clear

antecedents; investigation has already been completed; challan has been presented; the case of the petitioner is on same footing with co-accused, namely, Kulwinder Singh @ Rohit, Vikram Kumar, Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi, Renu Kant and Hakam Singh, who have already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide a common order dated 10.03.2026 passed in **CRM-M Nos.67300, 69519, 71225, 71584 & 71645** (Annexure P-4); the trial of the case will take sufficient time to conclude, this Court finds merit in the present petition as no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability of accused is to be decided after appreciating evidence adduced by both the parties and it is a trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

April 20, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |