



CRM-M-26879-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-26879-2025  
Date of decision: 03.07.2025

Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. A.K. Katter, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, D.A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0055	29.04.2025	Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib	304 (2), 204, 205, 308(7), 190, 191(3) of BNS 2023

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.

2. In paragraph 15 of the bail petition, the accused declares that he has no criminal antecedents. However, per paragraph H (23) of the status report filed by the State, the accused has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	102	23.06.2025	-	-

3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the status report filed by the State, which reads as follows:

*“2. That the brief facts of the case are that the present case has been registered on the statement of the complainant Naseem Akhtar, who stated to the effect that;  
(i) He works at sound and light system at Ludhiana. Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa (present petitioner) is known to complainant. Now he resides at Hampton Home, Chandigarh road, Ludhiana. Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa told him that he had seen a property at Fatehgarh Sahib which belongs to NRI party and they would get the land at quite lower rates. There could be a great profit in the same. Thereupon, the complainant disclosed about the same to his friend Prajal who gave his consent to*



CRM-M-26879-2025

*purchase the above said land.*

*ii) Thereafter, they told Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa (present petitioner) that they would purchase the land in half share each. They saw the land. They liked the land. They did not execute any agreement to sell of the above-mentioned land by believing Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa (present petitioner).*

*iii) That the complainant further stated that on 12.04.2025, they (Nasem Akhtar & Prajal) arranged the amount of Rs.45,00,000/- each and put them into two bags and went to Fatehgarh Sahib in the village Saddo Majra where land was situated. The complainant stated that the said amount was raised on loan by his father regarding which he could produce the record lateron. Both of them had gone in their car and Jaswinder Kumar came in his car make Creta bearing registration no. PB10-HK-5588. When at about 02:30 pm, they reached at the spot, they saw that a car make i20 was already parked there. Two persons were present in the said car.*

*iv) That the complainant further stated that when they reached there, as per plan of Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa, Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa holded both the bags of cash and suddenly car make XUV 500 bearing registration no. CH01-AT-0575 came to the spot which was being driven by an employee in uniform along with three more persons. On the front and back sides of the car, the sticker of police sticker was pasted. Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa sat in the car along with the bags. After threatening complainant Naseem Akhtar and his friend Prajal to kill them, they went away from the spot. Due to fear, they went back to their homes. Thereafter, they moved an application regarding the same and inquired about the matter at their own level and found that Jaswinder Kumar along with 5-6 accomplices had committed dacoity with them.”*

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the status report.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which read as follows:

***“F. The evidence against the petitioner***

***21.*** *That there is overwhelming material on record to establish the petitioner's role as the principal conspirator. The complainant's version has been consistently reiterated across multiple statements. Co-accused Beant Singh disclosed under Section 23 of the BSA that the petitioner gave him Rs.5,00,000/- from the looted money. In FIR no.102 dated 23-06-2025, the petitioner himself admitted that Rs.30,00,000/- from the proceeds of the present FIR No.55 fell to his share. This disclosure has substantial evidentiary value and directly links the petitioner to the proceeds of crime. The recovery of a vehicle bought using part of the stolen amount further strengthens the case.*



CRM-M-26879-2025

**G. The role of the petitioner.**

22. *That the petitioner Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa is the mastermind and key conspirator in the present case. He was the one who fabricated the false story of a land deal involving an NRI owner to lure the complainant into arranging Rs.90,00,000/- in cash. He identified the land, feigned negotiations, and convinced the complainant and his associate to come to the place of occurrence with the entire cash amount. At the spot, it was the petitioner who took both bags containing Rs.90,00,000/- and immediately fled the scene with his accomplices in a vehicle bearing fake police stickers. His name has been consistently mentioned by the complainant, and his role has been corroborated by co-accused Manjeet Singh and Beant Singh. Most significantly, the petitioner himself disclosed during his interrogation in FIR No.102 dated 23-06-2025 that he received Rs.30,00,000/- as his share from the proceeds of the present FIR No.55. This not only confirms his direct benefit from the crime but also exposes his central role in planning and executing the offence.”*

7. Allegations against the petitioner are that the petitioner is the one who took both bags containing Rs.90 lacs and fled from the spot in a vehicle bearing fake police stickers and he has been named consistently by the complainant. There is sufficient evidence involving the petitioner with the alleged offense. It is not a case for anticipatory bail.

8. The sly way the petitioner conned the complainant points out the dangerous trend of the revival of thuggee by revisiting the history.

9. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for anticipatory bail. The impact of crime would also not justify anticipatory bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

10. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

11. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

03.07.2025  
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes  
Whether reportable: No.