



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-67596 of 2025

Date of Decision: 12.02.2026

Sajan Singh alias Sajan

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Ms. Garima Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Senior Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition under Section(s) 483 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred to as “BNSS” only, has been moved for grant of bail with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 115 dated 29.11.2015 under Section(s) 379-B(2) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 Police Station Majitha, District Amritsar Rural, Punjab.

2. The FIR of this case came into being on the statement of ‘Jasbir Singh’ hereinafter being referred to as “complainant” only. It was stated by the above named complainant that on 29.11.2015, he had visited Majitha town to buy household items near the shop of Lucky Ready-made Clothes in main bazaar, three boys riding on ‘Pulsar motorcycle’ bearing registration No. PB-02-CD-3977 came close to him and one of them snatched his mobile phone carrying sim No. 8872443540. According to above named

complainant, after snatching he chased the above mentioned motorcycle and managed to pull down one of the assailants who disclosed his name as 'Sajan Singh' son of Yashpal. As per complainant, the remaining two persons whose names were disclosed as 'Sukhdev Singh' and 'Bhola' managed to flee from the spot.

3. It is the case of prosecution that in view of above mentioned statement, the formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. No formal reply has been filed by the State. However the learned State Counsel has orally opposed the present petition.

5. Heard.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. With regard to present petition, it is relevant to mention here that the petitioner in the present case was enlarged on bail but on one date fixed by the learned trial Court he did not appear and therefore, his bail was cancelled and bonds were forfeited to the State. Thereafter, the petitioner approached this court and on the directions of this court, he surrendered before the trial Court and was given the benefit of bail again. However, after being released on bail on second occasion, the petitioner again failed to turn up before the trial Court on 08.10.2021 and therefore his bail was cancelled again and bonds were forfeited to the State. On that occasion he was declared a proclaimed offender. Once declared a proclaimed offender the petitioner continued to be at large till 29.01.2025 when he was arrested by

the police.

7. With regard to present petition, it has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is a simpleton person who noted down a wrong date due to which he could not appear before the trial Court on the date fixed. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, otherwise also the petitioner has clean antecedents, and is in custody for a period of more than one year & two months. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future and therefore, the petitioner is entitled for bail.

8. It has been contended by learned State Counsel that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, and that the petitioner is a person, who has already misused the concession of bail on two occasions in the past. It has also been contended by learned State Counsel that the petitioner was declared a proclaimed offender, and that his presence before the Court could be procured only on execution of warrants of arrest, whereas to show his bonafide he should have surrendered before the Court. Thus he remained absent for more than three years.

9. With regard to abovementioned contention, it is relevant to note that the petitioner who has already misused the concession of bail on two occasions, and on second occasion he had been absconding for a period of more than three years and was declared proclaimed offender, is not entitled for a lenient view.

10. Here this fact can't be ignored that on second occasion the petitioner never turned up before the trial Court and he was ultimately arrested by the police only. The above mentioned conduct of the petitioner

shows that he has a scant respect for the process of court and therefore, does not deserve a considerate view.

11. Taking into consideration the past conduct of the petitioner and the gravity of offence, it is hereby held that the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail. Thus, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby **dismissed**.

12. However, keeping in view the fact that the case is already more than ten years old and the fact that not even a single witness is stated to have been examined in this case, a direction is hereby issued to the learned trial Court to conclude the trial within a period of six months from the date of receipt of this order.

13. It is, however, made clear that any observation made here-in-above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

February 12, 2026
“DK”

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