



223

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

**CRM-M No.20816 of 2025
Date of Decision: 11.09.2025**

Gurpreet Singh @ Sonu**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ***********

Present :- Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

***********RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. Present fourth petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.151, dated 22.07.2020, under Sections 379-B, 411, 34 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Mohkamura, District Amritsar.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that the police party, while on patrolling on 22.07.2020, received a secret information to the effect that Gurpreet Singh @ Sonu and Jasbir Singh @ Lucky were in the habit of snatching mobile phones from passers-by and thereafter use to sell the same at lower prices to other people. It was informed that they were standing at Park No.40 Khu, Jora Fatak for selling the mobiles and in case of raid, they could be apprehended along with the snatched mobile phones. On receiving the secret information, the raiding party was constituted and reached the place, as disclosed in the secret information. Three young persons were seen standing by parking one Splendor



motorcycle, however on seeing the police, they got perplexed and tried to escape. Thereafter they were apprehended and on asking, they disclosed their names as Gurpreet Singh @ Sonu (petitioner), Jasbir Singh @ Lucky and Jaskaran Singh @ Karan and thus, their search was conducted. On conducting the search of Gurpreet Singh @ Sonu, one Datar was recovered from his right waist, whereas from the search of Jasbir Singh @ Lucky, one I Phone 6 golden coloured was recovered from his right pocket of shorts and on the search of Jaskaran Singh @ Karan, mobile make Samsung A50 from his right pocket of lower was recovered. The motorcycle make Splendor was taken into custody, thus, the FIR was registered and all were arrested on the spot. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. However the petitioner earlier granted bail by this court vide order dated 27.10.2020 passed in CRM-M-32995-2020, however he remained absent from the trial and thus, his bail was cancelled and he was declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 08.10.2024. Subsequently, he was arrested on 18.01.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for the grant of bail, however on hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, declined the bail application filed by the petitioner dated 04.12.2024. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing CRM-M-25986-2024 and CRM-M-50508-2024, however both were dismissed by this Court vide orders dated 31.07.2024 and 21.10.2024, respectively. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended



that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the FIR was registered in the present case on the basis of alleged secret information and the petitioner and co-accused were arrested on 22.07.2020. He has submitted that after having been arrested, the petitioner was granted bail by this Court vide order dated 27.10.2020, however as the petitioner remained absent from the trial, his bail was cancelled on 08.10.2024, thereafter the petitioner was declared proclaimed offender vide order dated 04.11.2023 and subsequently, he was arrested on 18.01.2024. He has submitted that since then, the petitioner is behind bars and completed incarceration of more than 1½ years, however there is no progress in the trial. He has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as the case was planted upon the petitioner on the basis of secret information. He has submitted that the co-accused are already on bail. He has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely involved in 03 other cases, however he is on bail in those cases. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the the petitioner has misused the concession of bail granted and thus the same was rightly cancelled and he was declared proclaimed offender. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 12 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined.

5. Heard.

6 On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was intentionally arrested in this



case on 22.07.2020, however this Court had granted him bail vide order dated 27.10.2020. Thereafter as he remained absent from the trial, he was declared proclaimed offender and he was again arrested on 18.01.2024. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year, 11 months and 11 days as on 10.09.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is involved in other cases as well, however he is on bail in three of the cases and in one, he has been acquitted. Out of 12 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time.

8. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

11.09.2025

rittu

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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