



241

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

**CRM-M No.61450 of 2025
Date of Decision: 14.01.2026**

Manjinder Singh @ Mani**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Mohit Kakkar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present third petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.60, dated 22.03.2024, under Sections 379-B(2) of IPC (Section 411 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Focal Point, District Ludhiana.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Raj Kumar, son of Pawan Mishra. It was alleged that on 21.03.2024, at about 08:45 P.M., the complainant was returning home from his factory and when he reached near Hero Cycle Factory, Phase-8, Focal Point, Nichi Mangli, Ludhiana, 02 persons came on motorcycle and they started threatening the complainant. One of them caught hold the complainant whereas the



another gave an iron rod blow on his fingers. Mobile phone of the complainant was also snatched. The complainant raised alarm and thus, the public gathered and both the snatchers were beaten by the public. On asking, their names were found to be Manjinder Singh (petitioner) and Vicky. However, after beating them, the public got afraid and then allowed them to escape. The request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 22.03.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 13.03.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court twice by way of filing CRM-M-29937-2024 and CRM-M-29934-2025, however the same were dismissed vide orders dated 06.02.2025 and 27.05.2025, respectively. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court by way of filing the present third petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that from the allegations made in the FIR, it is alleged that the petitioner was badly beaten by the public and he suffered injuries. He has submitted that thereafter the petitioner was admitted in the Hospital. He has submitted that once the petitioner was beaten by the public, there was



no occasion for him to carry the snatched mobile phone with him. He has submitted that false implication of the petitioner is evident. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from last more than 1½ years. He has vehemently contended that the complainant, namely, Raj Kumar, was provided various opportunities by the learned trial Court but he is intentionally not appearing before the learned trial Court for his examination in order to prolong the incarceration of the petitioner. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was apprehended by the public itself on the spot and he was given beatings. He has submitted that the snatched mobile phone was recovered from the petitioner. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 08 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses have been examined. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since 22.03.2024. Out of total 08 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses are yet to be examined. The complainant, as contended before this Court by learned counsel for the petitioner, has not appeared before the learned trial Court despite granted 08 opportunities. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 09 months and 17 days as



on 13.01.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

7. The veracity of the allegations and counter allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

14.01.2026

rittu

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)

JUDGE