

CRM-M-41870-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-41870-2025
Reserved on: 01.09.2025
Pronounced on: 30.09.2025

Manjit Singh alias Manjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. L.M. Gulati, Advocate (Through VC)
for the petitioner.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
55	29.04.2025	Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib	304(2), 204, 205, 308(7), 190, 191(3) BNS 2023 and Sections 310(2), 111 of BNS and 25/54/59 of Arms Act added later on

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. Per paragraph 16 of the bail petition as well as reply, the petitioner has the following criminal antecedents:

Sr. No.	FIR No.	Date	Offenses	Police Station
1	102	23.06.2025	310(2), 61(2), 111 BNS 2023, Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act and Section 310(2) of BNS added later on	Sirhind
2	55	29.04.2025	---	Fatehgarh Sahib
3	11	02.03.2025	308(2), 62, 3(5) of BNS 2023	Rawalpindi, District Kapurthala

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

CRM-M-41870-2025

“2. That the brief facts of the case are that the present case 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 the sound and light system at Ludhiana. Jarwinder Komar @Jassa is known to the complainant. Now he resides at Hampton Home, Chandigarh Road, Ludhiana Jaswinder Kumar Jansa told him that he had seen a property at Fatehgarh Sahib which belongs to the 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 purchase the above said land.

(ii) Thereafter, they told Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa 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 the above-mentioned land by believing Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa.

(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 later on. Both of them had gone on their car, and Jaswinder Kumar came on 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 the plan of Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa, Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa held both the bags of cash and suddenly the car make XUV 500 bearing registration no. CH-01-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 the complainant, Naseem Akhtar and his friend Prajal to kill them, they went away from the spot. Due to fear, Athey 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.

v) That finding the prima facie case was made out under section 304(2) of BNS, the present FIR was registered under section 304(2) BNS against Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa and 5 unknown persons.”

CRM-M-41870-2025

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. Counsel further submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

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

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

“19A. The evidence based on which the petitioner was arraigned as an accused

That the petitioner Manjit Singh was arraigned basis of the supplementary statement of complainant Naseem Akhtar dated 14-05-2025, wherein he specifically named Manjit Singh as one of the participants in the dacoity of Rs. 90 lakhs committed on 12-04-2025 along with Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa and others. Further, during interrogation dated 15-05-2025, the petitioner himself disclosed his active participation in conducting reconnaissance of the spot and later joining the co-accused in the execution of the robbery using Beant Singh's XUV vehicle. This disclosure was corroborated by the recovery of the vehicle purchased by co-accused Beant Singh with part of the looted amount.

The role of the petitioner

That the role of the petitioner Manjit Singh is that he, in connivance with Beant Singh, first conducted reconnaissance of the place of occurrence at village Saddo Majra on 12-04-2025 and thereafter, upon arrival of the co-accused Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa, Sachin Pandit, Ranjit Singh, and another in uniform, he joined them in Beant Singh's XUV vehicle bearing registration number CH-01AT-0575. Together, they robbed Rs. 90 lakhs from complainant Naseem Akhtar and his friend Prajal after threatening them with dire consequences. Thus, the petitioner's role was integral in both preparation and execution of the offence of dacoity.”

REASONING:

7. Allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature as he along with co-accused took away bag containing Rs.90 lacs and fled away in a vehicle bearing fake

CRM-M-41870-2025

police sticker and bail of co-accused Jaswinder Kumar @ Jassa and Dharam Vir, has already been dismissed by this Court.

8. 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.

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

10. **Petition dismissed.** Interim orders are recalled with immediate effect. All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

30.09.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.