



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH  
109

CRM-M-66130-2025  
Decided on : 11.03.2026

Jora Singh . . . Petitioner(s)  
Versus  
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Virender Kumar, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).  
  
Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.  
  
Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

| Name & age of Petitioner (s) | FIR No. | Date       | Section(s)                                                                                                                 | Police Station | District |
|------------------------------|---------|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Jora Singh, aged 47 years    | 184     | 31.12.2024 | 140(3), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and [S. 103, 238 of BNS, 2023 added later on] [Old Sections 302, 365, 120-B & 201 of IPC, 1860] | Nehianwala     | Bathinda |

2. The FIR in the present case was registered at the instance of the complainant – Puran Singh, who is the brother of the deceased – Bakhtaur Singh, aged about 57 years. Earlier, Bakhtaur Singh was married to one Paramjeet Kaur, who had died about 8/9 years ago. Subsequent to the death of his wife, Bakhtaur Singh came in contact with Gurpreet Kaur w/o



Harwinder Singh and often used to talk to her from his mobile numbers, i.e., 94177-72945, 98526-98525 and 76278-61460, on the mobile numbers of Gurpreet Kaur, i.e., 78146-46889 and 79860-25617.

Bakhtaur Singh was residing at Dera Baba Bhagat Ram as Dera Head in village Dan Singh Wala, District Bhatinda. It is alleged that an amount of Rs.10.00 lakhs had been paid to Gurpreet Kaur by Bakhtaur Singh, reposing faith in her; however, the same was not returned.

3. As per the allegations, Gurpreet Kaur often used to visit the Dera along with her accomplices, namely Jora Singh, Sikander Singh @ Chitti and Avtar Singh, as had earlier been told to the complainant by Bakhtaur Singh.

On 23.12.2024, Jora Singh, Sikander Singh @ Chitti and Avtar Singh came to meet Bakhtaur Singh at the Dera. Avtar Singh and Jora Singh stayed at the Dera, whereas Sikander Singh @ Chitti took Bakhtaur Singh along with him on the motorcycle belonging to Bakhtaur Singh at about 07:00 P.M.

When Bakhtaur Singh neither returned nor could be contacted on the phone, a missing complaint was lodged by the complainant on the next day, i.e., 24.12.2024. As per the missing report lodged by the complainant, Puran Singh recorded that Bakhtaur Singh was lastly seen with Sikander Singh @ Chitti and did not name anybody else who accompanied Bakhtaur Singh.

After the dead body was noticed in a canal, the FIR in question came to be registered under Sections 302, 365, 120-B & 201 of IPC, 1860, against all the accused whose names were mentioned in the FIR.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the petitioner had no connection with the deceased or even with Gurpreet Kaur. Moreover, the admitted position in the FIR is that the deceased had left the Dera in the company of Sikander Singh @ Chitti. Nowhere in the missing report or even in the FIR is it mentioned that the petitioner ever accompanied the deceased – Bakhtaur Singh while leaving the Dera.

It is further argued that co-accused of the petitioner, namely Rajiya vide CRM-M-11128-2025 and Amarjeet Kumar @ Pawan vide CRM-M-21213-2025, though not mentioned as accused in the FIR, have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide common order dated 29.04.2025 (Annexure P-2).

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 08.03.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

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

6. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, argues that Jora Singh is one of the main accused and was in connivance with Gurpreet Kaur, who had taken an amount of Rs.10.00 lakhs for sending her daughter abroad.

Primarily, it is submitted that since his name is mentioned in the FIR along with other accused, the petitioner should not be granted the concession of anticipatory bail.

It is further argued that his name is mentioned in the FIR along with other co-accused with the allegation that the petitioner – Jora Singh was



also present at the Dera on the night when Bakhtaur Singh left the place in the company of Sikander Singh @ Chitti.

Besides, learned State counsel submits that as per para No.9 of the status report, the petitioner is shown to be involved in two more criminal cases.

In response thereto, learned counsel for the petitioner produces photocopies of two orders and submits that in both the cases, i.e., (i) FIR No.86 dated 19.06.2022, registered under Sections 376, 511, 323 and 506 of IPC and Sections 4 and 18 of the POCSO Act at Police Station Sangat, District Bathinda, the petitioner has been acquitted in the absence of any substantive incriminating evidence on record vide judgment dated 11.05.2023 passed by the learned Judge, Special Court, Bathinda; and (ii) FIR No.131 dated 14.10.2016, registered under Section 61/1/14 of the Excise Act at Police Station Sangat, District Bathinda, the petitioner along with the co-accused has been discharged from the said case.

Photocopies of the aforesaid orders are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

7. Despite being asked repeatedly, neither the learned State counsel nor the learned counsel for the complainant has been able to indicate or produce any evidence collected during the course of investigation regarding the presence of Jora Singh at the Dera situated in village Dan Singh Wala, District Bathinda.

8. In the absence of any such evidence, this Court does not find any substantial reason for subjecting the petitioner to custodial interrogation.

Accordingly, petitioner is directed to join the investigation



within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

9. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

10. With the directions issued here above, **present petition stands disposed of.**

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

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**March 11, 2026**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*      *Yes/No*  
*Whether Reportable:*              *Yes/No*