



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

141

CRM-M-72769-2025
Decided on : 24.02.2026

RINKY SINGH ALIAS RINKU ALIAS RINKU SINGH
.....Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Prashant Vashisth, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant 3rd petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Rinky Singh @ Rinku @ Rinku Singh, aged 38 years	41	19.02.2024	395/506/120-B of IPC r/w sections 25/27 of Arms Act	Sahnewal	Ludhiana

2. Before commencing the arguments, counsel for the petitioner submits that present petition is the third petition filed by the petitioner. First bail petition, CRM-M-47683-2024, was withdrawn on



16.01.2025, and subsequently, the second bail petition, CRM-M-35962-2025, was also withdrawn on 16.07.2025 (Annexure P-4).

3. As per prosecution case, complainant namely Shainder Shah was sitting in his shop when 2/3 unknown persons persons armed with pistols came there. They snatched his wallet containing about Rs.15,000–20,000/- as well as Rs.85,000/- lying in the drawer and ran away. They had kept their faces covered while two of their companions were standing outside. Thereafter, he informed his friend namely Vikas and inquired at their own level and came to know about the names of one of those persons as Pargat Singh and his companion Rinku Singh (petitioner herein). Petitioner was arrested on 14.03.2024. Co-accused Pargat Singh, Durgesh Tiwari and Surjit Singh alias Surjit Singh Sandhu were also arrested and after completion of investigation, final report has been presented in the Court for trial.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that petitioner is in custody since 14.03.2024. Offence in question was committed by unknown persons, who had kept their faces muffled. No test identification parade of the petitioner has been got conducted by the police after his arrest and rather, he was shown to the complainant. Out of 11 witnesses cited by the prosecution, not a single witness has been examined, till date. The trial is thus likely to take a long time to conclude and further detention of the petitioner is not required and he may be released on bail.

Additionally, it is submitted that similarly situated co-accused, namely Pargat Singh, vide order dated 28.11.2025 (passed in



CRM-M-72769-2025

3

CRM-M-54789-2025) (Annexure P-2), and Surjit Singh alias Surjit Singh Sandhu, vide order dated 19.12.2025 (passed in CRM-M-69226-2025), have been granted the concession of regular bail by the coordinate Bench of this Court. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

5. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 23.02.2026 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.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 01 year 11 months and 09 days period inside jail.

6. Learned State counsel has opposed the bail and has sought its dismissal on the ground of gravity of the offence and the fact that petitioner will try to win over the witnesses in case he is released on bail.

7. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by counsel for the parties and has also gone through the record available before it.

8. Undoubtedly, offence in question was committed by unknown persons, who had kept their faces covered. The effect of withholding of test identification parade shall be the subject matter of trial. Petitioner is in custody since 14.03.2024, i.e. for a period of about 1 year 11 months and 9 days. After completion of investigation, *challan* was presented but not a single witness has been examined, till date. Trial is thus not likely to be concluded in the near future.



It is well settled that bail is the rule and jail is an exception and pre-trial incarceration cannot be used as a tool to punish an offender and no useful purpose will, thus, be served by detaining the petitioner in custody any more and he deserves to be released on bail. Moreover, similarly situated co-accused namely Surjit Singh @ Surjit Singh Sandhu and Pargat Singh have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court.

9. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

10. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.



CRM-M-72769-2025 5

13. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

14. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

24.02.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO