

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

2026 PHHC 069223



CRM-M-24101-2026 (O&M).
Date of decision: 05.05.2026.

SANDEEP SINGH ALIAS MOTA

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent(s)

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

PRESENT Mr. Sidhant Vermani, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

This is the second petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.118 dated 11.06.2019, under Section(s) 379-B(2) and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar. The first petition seeking grant of regular bail was dismissed as withdrawn vide order

dated 17.03.2025.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner was already granted regular bail in the aforesaid FIR vide order dated 18.12.2019, however, he failed to appear before the trial Court on 19.10.2021 whereupon his bail was cancelled. Petitioner remained absent from the trial and was declared a proclaimed person vide order dated 07.12.2023. The petitioner was re-arrested on 29.05.2024. He contends that thereafter the petitioner is in custody for nearly two years but only 04 witnesses out of 11 witnesses cited by the prosecution have been examined so far. It is submitted that there were a total of 03 other cases against the petitioner but all these cases pertain to the year 2019 or prior thereto and that he is not involved in any other case since 2019 and even though during the period he absented from the trial. He contends that the trial has been progressing at a slow pace and no reason has been assigned for failure to conclude the prosecution evidence.

State counsel does not dispute that the facts as noticed aforesaid.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and without commenting any further on the merits of the case, taking into consideration that the petitioner was already on regular bail and that after his absence, he has already undergone an actual custody of nearly 02 years while only 04 witnesses out of 11 witnesses cited by the prosecution have been examined so far, I deem it appropriate to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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.

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.

May 05, 2026.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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