

2026:PHHC:047694



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

135

CRM-M-73946-2025
Date of Decision: 25.03.2026

RAMAN @ SONU

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. M.S. Rana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.66 dated 30.06.2022 under Sections 121-A, 124-A, 153-A and 120-B and Sections 66-A and 66-F of IT Act, 2000 registered at Police Station Cantt. Jalandhar, District Jalandhar.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is alleged to have scribed the words “Khalistan Jindabad” and “4 July 1955” on the boundary wall of Punjab Armed Police Complex, near Gate No.1, Jalandhar. At the same time, a video containing allegedly inflammatory content was circulated on social medial platforms, which was claimed by the prosecution to be intended to disturb the public tranquility and incite disaffection towards the Government of India. Later on, the petitioner, who was already in custody in some other case bearing FIR No.102 dated 28.08.2022 under similar section registered Police Station Navi Baradari, Jalandhar, made a disclosure statement to the effect that he was the person who had written the abovementioned slogans on the boundary wall of Punjab Armed Police Complex, near Gate No.1, Jalandhar. As such, the petitioner was taken into custody in the present case also. It is also alleged that the petitioner had received money from one

Bikramjit Singh Khalsa resident of Canada for carrying out vandalism and writing abovementioned slogans on the wall of PAP Complex, Jalandhar.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations against the petitioner are false and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that while recording the disclosure statement of the petitioner, he was already in custody in some other case and as per record no independent witness has been joined while recording the said disclosure statement. He further submits that apart from the self-made disclosure statement of the petitioner, there is no other incriminating material to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 years, 05 months and 24 days and out of 23 witnesses, only 09 witnesses have been examined till date and as such, the trial of the case will take a long time to conclude. He further submits that the petitioner is involved in three other cases, however, in one of them, he has been acquitted and in one other case, he has been released on bail. However, he is in custody in the third case bearing FIR No.102 dated 28.08.2022.

4. Learned State Counsel, on the other hand, vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are very serious in nature and the petitioner has actively participated in the alleged offence. He further submits that the petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in other criminal cases of similar nature. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate produced by the State Counsel is taken on record.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for last approximately three and a half years coupled with the fact that the trial of the case is likely take a long time to conclude as well as the fact that the implication of the petitioner in the present case is based on his own disclosure statement made by him while in police custody, this Court is of the opinion that the petition in hand deserves to be allowed. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of

the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

MARCH 25, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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