



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

124

CRM-M-57649-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 09.03.2026

Daljit Singh @ Daljit @ Yakki

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Joginder Pal Devgan, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(through V.C.).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This third petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.11 dated 07.04.2023, registered under Section(s) 458, 380, 394, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959, (Sections 483, 323 of I.P.C. were added and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 was deleted later on, whereas the charge-sheet was filed under Sections 456, 394, 506, 323, 411, 473, 34 of I.P.C.) at Police Station Mattewal, District Amritsar Rural. The second petition for grant of bail had been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 25.07.2024 passed by this Court.

2. The present FIR has been lodged on the statement of Sarabjit Singh, to the effect that on the intervening night of 6/7.04.2023, at about 1-

1:30 AM, two youngsters entered into his house and committed robbery. It was stated that one of the intruders was carrying a pistol while the other was carrying a sharp edged weapon like knife and they threatened the complainant by pointing the pistol at him and compelled him to open the almirahs lying in the storeroom and stole two gents rings, one ladies ring and Rs.500/- in cash. It was further stated that when other family members of the complainant woke up, the intruders tried to flee and one of them fired from his pistol which hit the toe of the complainant. It is also averred that during the commotion, the cloth from the face of the intruder carrying the pistol got removed and complainant identified him as Daljit Singh @ Yakki (petitioner herein) son of Joginder Singh. Thereafter, both the youngsters managed to flee and the complainant was taken to the Civil Hospital Tarsikka, Amritsar, where treatment was provided and then FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on account of a prior dispute with the complainant as a result whereof a false version naming the petitioner has been given. He contends that the petitioner has been in custody since 07.04.2023 and has undergone an actual custody of nearly 02 years and 11 months. He further submits that only 02 out of the total 14 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude. It is also contended that custodial detention of the petitioner is not likely to advance any interest of justice and two co-accused, namely, Gurjant Singh @ Janta and Simarjit Singh @ Simma, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide a common order dated 15.12.2023.

4. Learned counsel for respondent-State, on the other hand, contends that recovery of 02 gold rings alongwith Rs.500/- had been effected at the instance of the petitioner, hence, participation of the petitioner stands established. He further contends that a toy pistol had been used for committing the offence. However, the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner and the stage of trial wherein only 02 out of total 14 prosecutions witnesses have been examined so far as well as the factum of concession of regular bail already being granted to the two co-accused, are not disputed.

5. Without commenting on the merits of the case and taking into consideration facts and circumstances as noted above including the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, the nature of allegations levelled against him, the factum of the two co-accused, namely, Gurjant Singh @ Janta and Simarjit Singh @ Simma, having already been granted the concession of regular bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide a common order dated 15.12.2023, the stage of trial and further bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

7. It is made clear 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 hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

09.03.2026
Mangal Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE