



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

237

CRM-M No.70873 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.02.2026

Manjinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. G.P.S.Ghuman, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through hybrid mode).

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

The petitioner, who is in custody since 20.04.2025, has filed the present petition for bail with regard to commission of offence punishable under Sections 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, hereinafter being referred to as 'BNS', and Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 of Explosive and Substance Act 1908, arising out of FIR No.04 dated 11.04.2025, Police Station SSOC District SAS Nagar. This is Ist petition for bail, under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, hereinafter being referred to as 'BNSS'.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the basis of a tip-off given by a reliable source, when a police party headed by Sub Inspector 'Jagandeep Singh' intercepted the car bearing registration No.PB-23AA-4131 wherein 'Manjinder Singh' as driver and 'Jogga Singh' were travelling as driver & navigator, respectively. It was stated by the above named police officer that on search of the car, the



above mentioned police party recovered 1 improvised explosive device which was immediately defused by the bomb disposal squad. In addition to above, a metal container with four magnets feet, foam cover, electric detonator, transmitter, receiver, 1 parcel explosive containing 1.600 Kg. sprinter iron balls and small iron pins, were also recovered from the possession of petitioner.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that on recovery of above mentioned articles, the requisite formalities with regard to seizure, sealing of case property, slapping of FIR and formal arrest of accused were undertaken.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent, who has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that he has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than 9 months and 15 days. It has also been contented by learned counsel for the petitioner that no role has been attributed to the petitioner with regard to use of allegedly recovered IED and other explosive substance. As per learned counsel for the petitioner the FIR itself shows that the bag containing the above mentioned material was placed near the feet of co-accused 'Jogga Singh', and thus, no actual physical possession of the above mentioned bag (containing explosive substance) can be attributed to the petitioner.

7. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also argued that the petitioner has clean antecedents, except one case under NDPS Act pending against him. As per learned counsel for the petitioner there is no



supportive evidence to show that the petitioner had got any kind of link with the actual owner of the property i.e. 'Goldy Dhillon', who had allegedly deputed the petitioner to collect and deliver the same on the instructions of 'Goldy Dhillon'. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future, and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled for the benefit of bail.

8. Per contra, the learned State counsel has controverted the above mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel, there are very specific allegations against the petitioner for being in possession of explosive device, and that the entire story set up by the prosecution shows that it was the petitioner and his co-accused 'Jogga Singh', who on instructions of an infamous gangster had collected the above said explosive material for delivery as per instructions given to him. As per learned State Counsel the petitioner and his co-accused were carrying the explosive substance in their car with complete knowledge. According to learned State counsel, the allegations against the petitioner are so serious that the same may amount to waging war against the State and that design of the petitioner and his co-accused and others associates if successful, would have a devastating effect.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of record shows that in the present case there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner that he was found in possession of explosive substance which was found in a car driven by the petitioner. In addition to above, there are also allegation that the petitioner was very well aware of the fact that he had collected the explosive substance and



the same was to be delivered on the instructions of ‘Goldy Dhillon’.

11. In view of above mentioned fact this plea of petitioner fails to convince that simply because the bag was placed near the feet of co-accused ‘Jogga Singh’ the petitioner cannot be held to be in conscious possession of above mentioned explosive material. The allegations against the petitioner being quite specific and categorical in nature, in my opinion, at this stage, and when the custody period of petitioner is not large enough to draw an inference that he has been subjected to prolonged incarceration due to delay in trial, it is held that the present petition is devoid of merit and deserve dismissal. Hence, the same is hereby dismissed accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

05.02.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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