



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-60064-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.01.2026

SUKHWINDER SINGH @ SUKH GILL Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Lavish Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the complainant.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

CRM-52745-2025

The applicant through instant application under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is seeking preponement of the main case.

In view of prayer made in the application, the same is allowed and main case is taken on Board today itself.

CRM-52746-2025

Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-52747-2025

The applicant through instant application under Section 151 CPC is seeking permission to place on record compromise deed dated 19.12.2025 as Annexure A-1.



Allowed as prayed for.

Annexure A-1 is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

CRM-M-60064-2025

1. This is the first application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.230, dated 27.08.2025, registered at Police Station Dharamkot, District Moga, Punjab, under Section 420 of IPC, 1860.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

3. As per allegations in the FIR, the petitioner had taken a sum of Rs. 18 lakh from the complainant for sending his daughter abroad but she was not sent. The petitioner was arrested on 14.09.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter has now been settled with the complainant. He has placed on record the compromise deed dated 19.12.2025 as Annexure A-1 and, as per the said compromise, the entire amount has been returned to the complainant. Learned counsel further contended that the petitioner is in custody since 14.09.2025. The trial, which is a magisterial trial, is thus likely to take a long time to conclude. Since the matter has been compromised, no useful purpose will be served by keeping him in custody, and he may be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner has committed a heinous offence and, in view of the gravity of the offence, he does not deserve the concession



of bail. However, Mr. L.S. Sidhu, Advocate, who has appeared on behalf of the complainant, has admitted the factum of compromise and stated that he has no objection in case the petitioner is released on bail.

6. The parties are *ad idem* that the matter has now been settled between them. The petitioner is in custody since 14.09.2025. The trial, which is a magisterial trial, is thus likely to take a long time to conclude. Since the matter has been compromised, no useful purpose will be served by keeping him in custody, and he may be released on bail.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

09.01.2026
Ali

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