



-1-

CRM-M-63081-2024

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

108

CRM-M-63081-2024

Date of Decision: 09.01.2026

CHAMKAUR SINGH ALIAS NONU

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Nitish Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed for grant of regular bail under Section 483 of the BNSS in case FIR No. 43 dated 01.03.2024 under Sections 382 of IPC (Sections 395,324,412,411,120- B of IPC added and Sections 382 of IPC deleted later on) registered at Police Station, Tripuri, District Patiala.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with the co-accused has allegedly committed the offence of dacoity and took away a bag containing huge cash from the complainant after causing him injuries.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and has been implicated only in the supplementary statement, which was recorded after an unexplained delay of 14 days. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 09 months, and 25 days and prays that he be released on bail.

**CRM-M-63081-2024**

4. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court today, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that South African dollars have been recovered from the petitioner. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 09 months, and 25 days. On being asked, he further submits that out of 22 cited prosecution witnesses, only 04 witnesses have been examined so far.

5. Faced with the above situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is engaged in the business of money transactions and the amount recovered from the petitioner does not pertain to the amount alleged to have been snatched from the complainant.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that out of 22 cited prosecution witnesses only 04 have been examined so far; the petitioner was not named in the FIR; the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year 09 months and 25 days; the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the



CRM-M-63081-2024

satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if on bail so granted through the instant order, the applicant is found indulging in any other criminal case it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

09.01.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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