

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

2026:PHHC:030480



**(119+207)**

**1. CRM-M-35766-2025**

**Date of Decision: 25.02.2026**

Raju

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

**2. CRM-M-7674-2026**

Sarabjit Singh

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ.**

Present:- Mr. R.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the  
petitioner in CRM-M-35766-2025.

Mr. K.S. Kharbanda, Advocate for the  
petitioner in CRM-M-7674-2026.

Ms. Ramta Chaudhary, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ.J (Oral)**

1. By way of this common order, I dispose of the above said two petitions arising out of the same FIR.

2. Present petitions have been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.27, dated 05.04.2022, under Sections 379-B, 201, 411, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Verka, District Amritsar.

3. As per the facts of the case, the present FIR was registered on the complaint of Baldev Singh, wherein it was alleged that he had gone to Gujarat for a job interview and returned on 04.04.2022. On getting off at Amrtisar railway station, he boarded an auto rikshaw. In the meantime, two persons came in an auto and stopped his auto rikshaw. One of them

grabbed his arms while the other forcibly snatched his small bag which contained his original passport. They also forcibly snatched cash of Rs.2,000/- and thereafter escaped. It was further alleged that on his inquiry he came to know that the driver of that auto was Raju (petitioner in CRM-M-35766-2025) and the name of the other person was Sarabjit Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-7674-2026) and he could identify them if they are brought before him. A request was made to take legal action. On the registration of FIR, investigation commenced and petitioners were arrested on 05.04.2022. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, trial commenced. The petitioners approached the learned Trial Court and the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Amritsar granted bail to accused Sarabjit Singh vide order dated 21.07.2022, whereas accused Raju was granted bail vide order dated 25.08.2022, however, subsequently they remained absent from the proceedings and were declared Proclaimed Offenders on 01.03.2025. Thereafter, both the petitioners were arrested on 05.03.2025 and 04.03.2025 respectively. They approached the learned Trial Court praying for bail, however, the same were declined vide orders dated 11.04.2025 and 14.11.2025 respectively and hence, aggrieved, both the petitioners are before this Court praying for grant of bail.

4. Learned counsels for the petitioners contend that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is submitted that the FIR had been lodged by the complainant initially on the contention that the unknown persons had snatched cash etc. from him, however, thereafter, he has alleged that he at his own level came to know that it were the petitioners, who were the accused. It is submitted that petitioners never acquainted with the complainant. To buttress the arguments, counsels have

argued that even otherwise the petitioners were granted bail by the learned Trial Court, however, as they remained absent, hence they were declared Proclaimed Offenders. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner Sarabjit Singh submits that he has no criminal antecedents and is behind bars for the last more than 01 year. Similarly, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner Raju submits that though the petitioner is involved in two other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases. Thus, prayer for regular bail has been made.

5. Learned State Counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. She submits that petitioners were granted the benefit of bail by the learned Trial Court, however, they misused the concession of bail as is evident from the fact that both were declared Proclaimed Offenders. Learned State counsel has produced on record the custody certificates of the petitioners, which reveal that petitioner Raju is involved in two other cases. She, on instructions, submits that that out of total 09 prosecution witnesses 04 have been examined till date.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties, it is deciphered that the petitioners were granted bail by the learned Trial Court, however, as they remained absent, they were subsequently declared Proclaimed Offenders on 01.03.2025. As per custody certificates produced by learned State counsel petitioner Raju has undergone actual custody period of 11 months and 19 days as on 24.02.2026 and is involved in two other cases, however, he is on bail in those cases, whereas petitioner Sarabjit Singh has undergone actual custody period of 01 year, 03 months and 14 days as on 24.02.2026 and he is not involved in any other case. As per information

provided by learned State counsel out of total 09 prosecution witnesses, 04 have been examined till date and thus, the trial would take sufficient time to conclude.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commencing anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsels for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**25.02.2026**  
lucky

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

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