

2025:PHHC:042708



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

**CRM-M No.43255 of 2024  
Date of Decision: 27.03.2025  
Reserved on: 24.03.2025**

Sukhchain Singh @ Chaina ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Swati Batra, DAG, Punjab,  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J.**

1. The instant one is the 7<sup>th</sup> petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in case arising out of FIR No.0066 dated 25.02.2020 registered under Sections 379-B, 342, 459, 506 and 34 of IPC (Section 379-B and 34 of IPC were deleted and Sections 395, 460, 325, 411 and 201 of IPC were added later on) at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran. His previous petitions filed had been dismissed.
2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Bakhshish Singh alleging therein that on the intervening night of 24/25.02.2020, four unknown youths had

2025:PHHC:042708



come inside the Dera wherein the victim Baba Mohinder Singh was residing. They had assaulted the victim by causing injuries to him, had committed robbery of the donated/offered money in the Dera, had snatched his phone and after locking him in a room, had escaped. The victim had managed to make call to his disciples who had opened the door of his room and got him admitted in the hospital. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. As per the further allegations, during investigation, one Kuldeep Singh recorded his statement to the effect that on 22.02.2020, he had gone to the Dera and had seen the present petitioner along with four more persons namely, Satnam Singh, Tarsem Singh, Balwinder Singh and Sukhwinder Singh while sitting therein and making plan to commit offence of dacoity somewhere. The petitioner was nominated as an accused along with the above named persons. He was arrested. An amount of Rs.12 lakhs was recovered from his house on 29.02.2020. Subsequently also, he got recovered \$1,30,000 US dollars and cash amount Rs.1,82,000/-. The co-accused were also arrested and recoveries were effected from them. Investigation now stands completed and challan has been presented in the Court.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 29.02.2020. He was neither named in the FIR nor any specific role had been attributed to him. A false recovery has been planted upon him. Trial is likely to take time. The co-accused Balwinder Singh, Satnam Singh and Sukhwinder Singh have

2025:PHHC:042708



been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has already been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab has argued that the petitioner along with the co-accused had caused injuries to the victim Baba Mohinder Singh and committed robbery of a sum of Rs.1,75,00,000/- of the donated/offered money from the Dera of the victim. He had converted an amount of Rs.91 lakhs into US Dollars and had distributed the same amongst themselves. Some money was got recovered by him. He is a habitual offender as many as 12 other cases registered against him in the past. The victim and some eye-witnesses are yet to be examined. There are chances of his intimidating the witnesses or absconding if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. Learned counsel for both the parties have been heard at considerable length.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have committed lurking house trespass in the Dera of the victim, is alleged to have caused grievous injuries to the victim, to have looted donated/offered money kept in the Dera to the tune of Rs.1,75,00,000/- and is further alleged to have escaped with that money along with the co-accused. His previous bail applications had been dismissed on merit. The petitioner has not been able to point any any substantive or specious change in the circumstances since the date of dismissal of his previous petitions. The allegations against

2025:PHHC:042708



him are quite serious in nature. The victim and eye-witnesses are yet to be examined. The case of the petitioner cannot be stated to be at parity with the case of the co-accused. His antecedents are not at all clean and he has been held guilty and convicted in several cases of serious nature. The apprehension expressed by the State that he may commit similar offences cannot be stated to be unfounded. Mere prolonged period of custody cannot be considered to be a ground for extending benefit of bail to the petitioner. Keeping in view the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

**(MANISHA BATRA)**  
**JUDGE**

**27.03.2025**  
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No