

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-D-719-2025 (O&M)

JUDGEMENT RESERVED ON	JUDGEMENT PRONOUNCED ON	OPERATIVE PART PRONOUNCED OR FULL	UPLOADED ON
24.02.2026	16.03.2026	FULL PRONOUNCED	16.03.2026

Yuvraj Sing Chhina ...Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. P.B.S. Goraya, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Deepinder Singh, Senior Addl. Advocate General, Punjab with
Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
2	11.01.2023	State Special Operation Cell, SAS Nagar	Sections 17, 18 & 20 of UAP Act, 120-B IPC and 25 of Arms Act

Criminal Case number before the Sessions Court	CIS No.BA-643-2025 CNR No.PBSA0100-1726-2025
Date of Decision	19.03.2025

1. Aggrieved by the dismissal of regular bail by the Additional Sessions Judge, vide order dated 19.03.2025, the appellant had come before this Court by filing the present appeal, seeking bail in the FIR mentioned above.
2. As per the custody certificate dated 23.02.2026, the appellant has the following criminal antecedents: -

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
1.	18	18.01.2017	Contonment	379-B, 34 IPC

3. The facts of the case are being taken from reply dated 09.02.2026 filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, State Special Operation Cell, SAS Nagar, which reads as follows:

2. That, the Punjab Police registered a case FIR No.02 dated 11.01.2023 under Sections 17, 18, 20 of The Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act at State Special Operation Cell Mohali, on the basis of Secret Information Received by Shri Arun Mundan DSP State Special Operation Cell Mohali that Gangster Jagdeep Singh alias Jaggu Bhagwanpuria (appellant), Amritpal Singh alias Amrit Bal, Pargat Singh and Damanjot Singh are all now associated with Babbar Khalsa International Organisation and this organisation is being operated by Paramjit Singh alias Pamma resident of house no. 1263, Phase 3-B Mohali who is now residing in England and further associated with one organisation namely Sikhs For Justice (SFJ) which is banned by Government of India.

3. That, Jagdeep Singh @ Jaggu Bhagwanpuria along with one Pargat Singh used to provide them other persons and Arms ammunition for carrying out such Illegal activities and Amrit Bal and Daman Kahlon used to provide them financial help for carrying out such illegal activities.

4. That on the basis of Secret information Yuvraj Singh and Nishan Singh were arrayed as accused in this case. They were arrested from Verka Chowk Mohali on 17.1.2023 and one pistol 32 bore and 4 live cartridges 32 bore were recovered from them. One motorcycle without registration number was also recovered from them. During investigation on 18.1.2023 accused Nishan Singh disclosed that "accused Amrit Bal has introduced him to Jaspal Singh @ Honey S/o Hari Singh R/o village Uchha Bhadla Khanna, Ludhiana and his contact number is 70090xxxx. Thereafter he talked to Jaspal Singh who told him that he has stalked a Hindu leader in Khana and Amrit Bal has also sent him ammunition in this regard." thereafter Jaspal Singh @ Honey was nominated as an accused in this case and he was arrested on 19.1.2023. Accused Jaspal Singh during interrogation disclosed that he was introduced to Amrit Bal through accused Pargat Singh and on the asking of Amrit Bal he was stalked that a Hindu leader in Khana and Amrit Bal had also sent him a pistol to murder that Hindu leader which was later taken back by Amrit Bal through his unknown companion. That's why no recovery was affected from Jaspal Singh @ Honey. Many cases have already been registered against accused Yuvraj Singh, who while interrogation disclosed that he was known to Jagdeep Singh @ Jaggu Bhagwanpuria and Jaggu Bhagwanpuria had

introduced him to Amrit Bal. During interrogation accused Nishan Singh, Yuvraj Singh and Jaspal Singh disclosed that they had to murder Hindu leaders in Khana and Mohali and had to kill a comrade leader in Jalandhar. That Amrit Bal had sent money to them to this purpose. On 31.1.2023 accused Jagdeep Singh @ Jaggu Bhawangpuria was brought on production warrants from Bathinda Jail and he was arrested in this case.

5. It was during the investigation of this case that Jagdeep Singh @ Jaggu Bhagwanpuria suffered a disclosure statement that accused Yuvraj Singh was known to him and he had introduced Yuvraj Singh to Amrit Bal. That Amrit Bal, Darmanjot Singh and Pargat Singh was working with member of Babbar Khalsa International namely Paramjit Singh. Paramjit Singh gives them targets. Amrit Bal, Pargat and Darman through their companions are doing target killings in Punjab. That Paramjit Pamma had arranged negotiation between Paramjit Singh, Darman with I.S.I agents in Pakistan and through them they are sending arms and ammunition to Punjab through Rajasthan border.

4. The appellant's counsel seeks bail on the ground that he has been in custody for sufficient time and it's a false case.

5. The counsel for the State opposes bail on the grounds that the appellant is associated with gangsters and he is not entitled to bail. The learned counsel for the State further submits that the gangster, Jagdeep Singh @ Jaggu Bhagwanpuria and other dreaded criminals, namely Amritpal Singh @ Amrit Bal, Pargat Singh, Damanjot Singh and Paramjit Singh @ Pamma, who were members of Babbar Khalsa International Organization, are behind this incident, as such, the appellant is not entitled to bail.

6. We have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the record, including the reply and its analysis, which would lead to the following outcome.

7. In this background, analyzing the arguments of the appellant to seek bail are meaningless. It would be appropriate to refer to specific role of the appellant mentioned in the reply, which reads as follows:

“That during investigation, accused Yuvraj Singh disclosed that his co-accused Amrit Bal gave him target to kill a Hindu Leader and Comrade Leader. On the arrest of accused 01 pistol 32 bore along with live cartridge were recovered from them.

8. Given above, there is sufficient prima facie evidence against the appellant, as such, he is not entitled to bail on merits. Regarding custody, the appellant's custody in the present

case, as per the custody certificate dated 23.02.2026 is 03 years, 01 month and 02 days and he is not entitled to bail even on the ground of custody.

9. In UOI Rep. by Insp. of NIA v. Barakathullah, [2024] 5 S.C.R. 1011; 2024 INSC 452, May 22, 2024, the Hon'ble Supreme Court holds:

[2]. The Central Government in Ministry of Home Affairs, CTCR Division having received a credible information that the office bearers, members and cadres of Popular Front of India (PFI), an extremist Islamic organization have been spreading its extremist ideology across Tamil Nadu, by establishing State Headquarters at Purasaiwakkam, Chennai and also offices in various districts of Tamil Nadu and that through their frontal Organizations like Campus Front of India, National Women's Front, Social Democratic Party of India etc., they conspire for committing terrorist acts, raise funds for committing terrorist activities and recruit members for furthering their extremist ideology, and that the frontal organizations and PFI were involved in the recruitment of members to various prescribed terrorist organizations, passed an order on 16th September 2022, in exercise of the powers conferred under sub-section (5) of Section 6 read with Section 8 of the National Investigation Agency Act, 2008 (hereinafter referred to as the 'NIA Act'), directing the National Investigation Agency to take up investigation of the said case. In view of the said order, an FIR being RC-42/2022/NIA/DLI came to be registered on 19.09.2022 against the present respondents and other members and office bearers of PFI for the offences under Section 120(b), 153(A), 153(AA) of IPC and Section 13,17,18,18(B), 38 and 39 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the "UAPA").

[22]. In the instant case, we are satisfied from the chargesheet as also the other material/documents relied upon by the appellant that there are reasonable grounds for believing that the accusations against the respondents are prima facie true and that the mandate contained in the proviso to Section 43(D)(5) would be applicable for not releasing the respondents on bail. Having regard to the seriousness and gravity of the alleged offences, previous criminal history of the respondents as mentioned in the charge-sheet, the period of custody undergone by the respondents being hardly one and half years, the severity of punishment prescribed for the alleged offences and prima facie material collected during the course of investigation, the impugned order passed by the High Court cannot be sustained. We are conscious of the legal position that we should be slow in interfering with the order when the bail has been granted by the High Court, however it is equally well settled that if such order of granting bail is found to be illegal and perverse, it must be set aside.

10. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

11. Given above, the order of rejection of bail calls for no interference and the same is upheld. Appeal is dismissed. However, the trial be expedited. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

16.03.2026
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned	YES
Whether reportable	NO