



206

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

CRM-M-18194-2026

Date of decision : 10.04.2026

Arshdeep Singh @ Arshi

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Sumit Dua, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, D.A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.65 dated 18.03.2021, under Section 379-B of IPC (Section 34 IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar.
2. As per the facts of the case, the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Kamlesh. It was alleged that on 18.03.2020 at around 4:00 pm, she boarded the bus from Phillaur to Talwan and was sitting on first seat holding a plastic envelope in her hand containing cash amounting to Rs.20,000/-, a PAN card, ATM Card and cheque book. It was alleged that a young man aged about 24/25 years, came to her, who was wearing a mask and asked about time. In the meantime, the young boy snatched her envelope and ran away to Ludhiana side. Thus, the request was made to take the legal action against the accused. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced and the complicity of the petitioner surfaced on during investigation. Resultantly, the he was arrested. On completion of investigation, challan was



presented. On framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 24.03.2026. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-39730-2021 and he was granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide its order dated 07.04.2022. However, due to his non-appearance before the trial Court, he was declared a proclaimed offender on 02.06.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner was again arrested in the present case on 12.02.2026 and since then he is in custody. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR. He submits that as per the case of prosecution, the alleged snatching was committed by some unknown persons. He submits that there is no evidence regarding the identity of the petitioner and thus, he was granted bail by this Court vide order dated 07.04.2022 passed in CRM-M-39730-2021. He submits that as the petitioner remained absent during trial, hence, he was declared a proclaimed offender on 02.06.2025 and thereafter, he was again arrested on 12.02.2026. He submits that though the petitioner is falsely implicated in other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. He submits that the petitioner has been implicated in the present case only on the basis of assumptions and presumptions. He thus, submits that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the




submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender who is involved in other cases as well. He submits that though the petitioner was granted bail by this Court on 07.04.2022, however, he misused the concession of bail and thus, was declared a proclaimed offender and thereafter, he was again arrested on 12.02.2026. He submits that recovery of PAN card and ATMs card, were effected from the petitioner. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined so far. He has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner on record.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the present FIR was registered against some unknown persons. It has been argued before this Court that there is no evidence regarding the identity of the person, who snatched the envelope. There is no denial to the fact that the petitioner was granted bail by this Court vide order dated 07.04.2022, however, the same was cancelled as he remained absent during trial and thereafter, the petitioner was again arrested in the present case and since then he is in custody. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is involved in other cases as well. Out of total 12 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined till date.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner



is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. In case the bail bonds are not furnished by the petitioner during the period of 07 days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

10.04.2026
ps-I

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE