



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

208

CRM-M-18689-2026
Date of decision: 16.04.2026

JASPAL SINGH @ KALU

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Himanshu Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Dr. (Ms.) Savi Nagpal, Asst. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 30 dated 13.02.2023, registered under Section(s) 379-B, 120-B read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City Rampura, Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of one Kamaldeep Garg who submitted that on 12.02.2023, at about 8.30 pm, he was on his way back to his residence at Rampura Mandi from Thermal Colony, Lehra Mohabbat after his work. He was working as a

Cable Operator under the name of 'Kamal Cable Network'. He was going back home on his scooter Aactiva bearing registration No. PB03F-2044. After he crossed Lucky Dhabha, he was assailed upon by 04 persons riding on a motorcycle. One of the pillion riders of the motorcycle gave a stick blow at his right hand as a result whereof he fell down on the ground from his scooter. One of the assailants took out his mobile phone and cash of Rs. 22,000/- from his pocket. All the assailants gave kick and fist blows to the complainant. He raised hue and cry whereupon the assailants ran away from the spot by taking his mobile phone, cash and even his scooter from the spot. The complainant called his son from a mobile phone of passerby, who later checked that there was a withdrawal of Rs. 16,400/- also from the account of the complainant vide an Online entry by certain unknown persons leading to registration of the instant FIR.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the incident in question took place on 12.02.2023. The FIR was registered against unknown persons, however, a supplementary statement was recorded on 17.02.2023 wherein he named four persons i.e. Sukhpreet Singh @ Sukhni, Ramandeep Singh @ Mani, Saminder Singh and his own brother. The complainant alleged that assailants were given due information about his movement by his own employee i.e. co-accused Shaminder Singh. He contends that the petitioner is the said Kalu Singh who was nominated by the complainant as a co-accused in his supplementary statement. He contends that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner and he is custody since 21.01.2026. He contends that the investigation in the case is complete and despite the concluded investigation, the petitioner has neither been shown beneficiary of the transaction in any

manner nor he is attributed any motive and no recovery has also been effected. He contends that since investigation in the present case is complete, therefore, his further custodial detention would not warranted interest of justice.

4. Learned State Counsel does not dispute that no recovery has been effected from the petitioner and there is no specific role attributed to him either of having received any of the snatched property or any benefit thereof. The only attribution is that he was one of the rider of the motorcycle. It is further submitted that 14 witnesses still remain to be examined in the present case.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

6. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations against the petitioner, absence of recovery, the period of custody already undergone by him and also the fact that the investigation in the case is already complete and conclusion of trial shall take long time, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

APRIL 16, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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