



CRM-M-42296-2025(O&M)

1

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

116

CRM-M-42296-2025(O&M)
Decided on :09.03.2026

Ravinder Singh @ Sonu

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. J.S. Jaidka, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr.DAG, Punjab.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.64 dated 01.04.2018, under Sections 379-B, 34, 411 IPC, registered at Police Station GRP Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. Vide order dated 08.08.2025, following was recorded:

“ Prayer in the present petition, filed under Section 483 of the BNSS, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner-Ravinder Singh @ Sonu, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No. 64 dated 01.04.2018 under Sections 379B, 34, 411, of IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station GRP, Amritsar.



Counsel for the petitioner contends that earlier the petitioner was granted regular by the trial Court itself vide order dated 21.11.2011, however on account of being absent on 15.09.2021 and onwards also, the bail bonds/surety bonds were cancelled on 08.11.2021. Vide order dated 17.04.2023, the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender and after being arrested again on 12.12.2023, he is in custody till date.

On advance notice, Mr. B.P. Singh, has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent/State and filed custody certificate dated 08.08.2025, which is taken on record. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place. Copy of the same also supplied to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

As per the information given by the learned Assistant Advocate General-Punjab, out of 07 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. Primarily, counsel for the petitioner submits that since no witness has been examined and the petitioner is inside the jail for 02 year 03 months and 28 days, thus, his liberty cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period without proving charges of guilt. The next date of hearing before learned trial Court is fixed for 01.11.2025.

Let status report be filed, detailing therein the reason of delay in conducting the trial proceedings post 12.12.2025, on which date the petitioner was arrested again.

List again on 04.11.2025. ”



3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner points out that in the previous order, the date of the order whereby the petitioner was granted regular bail for the first time has been wrongly mentioned as 21.11.2011 instead of 21.11.2018.

FIR in question was registered against two unknown persons. Subsequently, upon change of the Investigating Officer, the prosecution alleged that certain secret information was received, and on that basis petitioner was arrayed as an accused in the present case.

Learned counsel further submits that out of the total seven prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date. He contends that the trial is likely to take considerable time and, therefore, prays for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that during the course of investigation, mobile phone which had been snatched was recovered from the possession of the petitioner. He contends that the said recovery is sufficient to establish the petitioner's connection with the crime in question. Accordingly, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. I have heard Learned Counsel for the parties and perused the paper book and the documents appended thereto.

6. Considering the totality of the circumstances and the fact that petitioner is in custody for a period of last 02 years, 10 months and 26 days, and that out of the total 07 prosecution witnesses none has been

**CRM-M-42296-2025(O&M)****4**

examined so far, this Court is of the considered opinion that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude. Without commenting on the merits of the case, present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

09.03.2026***Rashmi***

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