



118

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-54414-2025
Decided on : 21.04.2026

Pargat Singh @ Faggu . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. PKS Phoolka, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, 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 here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Pargat Singh @ Faggu	77	23.05.2020	379-B, 34 of IPC	Nehianwala	Bathinda

2. In a case pertaining to snatching of a mobile phone, the present FIR was registered against three persons, namely (i) Kulwinder Singh @ Gobind, (ii) Pargat Singh @ Faggu, and (iii) Prem Deep Singh @ Mani.

After registration of the FIR on 23.05.2020, the petitioner was granted concession of bail. However, on account of his absence on 22.01.2024,ailable warrants and thereafter non-ailable warrants were issued against him, and subsequently, he was declared a proclaimed offender vide order dated 21.04.2025. Thus, petitioner remained absent from the Court proceedings for a period of about one and a half years.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that considering the nature of allegations, petitioner had earlier been found entitled to the concession of bail. It is submitted that though petitioner misused the said



concession, however thereafter, he has already suffered incarceration by remaining inside the jail since October, 2025, i.e. for a period of about six months.

Learned counsel further submits that considering the total period inside jail after his re-arrest, a lenient view may be taken and petitioner be enlarged on bail, particularly when the trial is not likely to culminate in the near future.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 17.02.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. While opposing the prayer for bail, learned State counsel submits that keeping in view the nature of allegations and antecedents of the petitioner, he does not deserve any leniency. It is further submitted that there is every likelihood of the petitioner again absconding from the proceedings of the trial, which would ultimately delay its conclusion.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record with their able assistance, this Court finds that petitioner had earlier been granted concession of bail but failed to remain present before the learned trial Court, as a result whereof he was declared a proclaimed offender.

At the same time, it is a matter of record that petitioner is inside the jail since October, 2025 after his re-arrest. The offence alleged pertains to the year 2020 and the trial is still pending.

Though the conduct of the petitioner in remaining absent from the proceedings cannot be appreciated, yet continued incarceration for an indefinite period would also not serve any useful purpose, particularly when his presence during trial can be secured by imposing stringent conditions.

7. Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case, prayer made in the 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/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty



Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

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

9. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, 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.

10. It is made clear that in case the petitioner again absents himself from the trial proceedings without sufficient cause, it shall be open to the prosecution to seek cancellation of bail in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

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

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 21, 2026

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No