



CRM-M-50317-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-50317-2025
Decided on : 21.01.2026

Suraj

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Ms. Sangeeta Devi, Advocate for
Mr. N.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh Gill, Addl. A.G., Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Suraj	278	10.08.2018	379-B IPC	Sahnewal	Ludhiana

2. On the basis of secret information, FIR in question was registered against the petitioner–Suraj, Umesh Tiwari and one more accused Ajay Kumar. As per information, both the accused were indulged in snatching of mobile phones as well as cash from migrant labourers. It was further got recorded by the informant that the named accused persons had snatched one mobile phone even



CRM-M-50317-2025

today i.e. 10.08.2018 while riding Active bearing registration No. PB-08-CQ-1742 from one migrant labourer of Mittal Dharm Kanda.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that infact the petitioner was arrested, however, nothing was recovered from his possession. It is further pointed out that at first instance, the petitioner was released on bail by the Court of Sessions vide order dated 30.04.2019. Later on, bail of the petitioner was cancelled due to his absence from the Court without any intimation on 22.08.2019. After issuing non-bailable warrants, the petitioner was declared as proclaimed offender vide order dated 15.02.2020. He further argues that infact the petitioner is inside jail for a custody period of total 02 years and 30 days and if one more chance is granted to him, he undertakes that he would not be absent ever in future in due course of proceedings before the Court.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed custody certificate, confirming the total incarceration period of 02 years and 30 days.

5. Undoubtedly, petitioner is involved in other case also as per custody certificate. However, in both the cases i.e. FIR 212/2017 dated 05.07.2017 and FIR No. 66/2017 dated 20.02.2017, it has been mentioned that the petitioner has already undergone his sentence and has been released from custody. In case FIR No. 2 dated 27.09.2023, the petitioner is mentioned to be already released on bail, thus as of now, the petitioner is inside jail only in the present case. Keeping in view the total incarceration period i.e. 02 years and 30 days undergone by the petitioner, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to him.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**.

Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety



CRM-M-50317-2025

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. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

10. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 21, 2025

reena

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