

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

2026:PHHC:007387



118

CRM-M-71389-2025

Date of decision: 20.01.2026

Date of uploading: 20.01.2026

Ravinder Singh

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ranwant Singh Sangha, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 79 dated 02.05.2024, registered under Section 379-B (2) of IPC, at Police Station Sidhwan Bet, District Ludhiana.

2. The gravamen of the FIR is that the petitioner, along with his accomplice, allegedly at weapon point forcibly snatched a tractor-trolley loaded with wheat from the complainant while he was getting his crop harvested with the help of a combine harvester. It is further alleged that the motive behind the said occurrence was a money dispute between the accused persons and Pipal Singh, the father of the owner of the land, of which the complainant was stated to have prior knowledge.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 08.04.2025. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that the genesis of the FIR in question is a civil dispute, which has been given the colour of a criminal case, so as to arm-twist the petitioner and another accused. Learned counsel has iterated that in any case investigation qua the FIR is complete and culmination of trial will take long. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 19.01.2026 in Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 08.04.2025 whereinafter investigation was carried out and challan was presented on 10.06.2025. Total 8 witnesses have been cited, but none has been examined till date. It is, thus, indubitable that conclusion of the trial will take long. The rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties; as to the whether the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR, shall be gone into during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage lest it may prejudice the rights of either of the parties. Nothing tangible has been brought forward

to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the remaining prosecution evidence.

6.1. As per the custody certificate dated 19.01.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has suffered incarceration for more than 9 months and 11 days. As per the said custody certificate, the petitioner is stated to be involved in multiple other FIRs/cases. However, this factum cannot be a ground sufficient by itself, to decline the concession of regular bail to the petitioner in the FIR in question when a case is made out for grant of regular bail *qua* the FIR in question by ratiocinating upon the facts/circumstances of the said FIR. Reliance in this regard can be placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi v. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (1) RCR (Criminal) 586***; a Division Bench judgment of the Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in case of ***Sridhar Das v. State, 1998 (2) RCR (Criminal) 477*** & judgments of this Court in ***CRM-M No.38822-2022*** titled as ***Akhilesh Singh v. State of Haryana***, decided on 29.11.2021, and ***Balraj v. State of Haryana, 1998 (3) RCR (Criminal) 191***.

Suffice to say, the further detention of the petitioner in custody is not required in the facts and circumstances of the case.

7. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.

- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit his passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cell phone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.
- (vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Since the main case has been decided, pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

January 20, 2026
Naveen

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