



CRM-M-55728-2025

1

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

231

**CRM-M-55728-2025  
Decided on: October 13, 2025**

**Palwinder Singh****.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Aazam Khan, Advocate,  
for Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

<b>Name of Petitioner</b>	<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Sections</b>	<b>Police Station</b>	<b>District</b>
<b>Palwinder Singh</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23.02.2021</b>	<b>406, 420, 120-B and 506 IPC (offence under Sections 467, 468 and 471 IPC added lateron)</b>	<b>Division No. 6, District Police Commissionerate</b>	<b>Jalandhar</b>



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, in fact, the main accused in the present case is Vipin Kumar and his family members, who has cheated the complainant for an amount of Rs. 7,00,000/- on the pretext of providing him job. However, neither the job was provided nor the amount was returned back to the complainant by the said Vipin Kumar. Further submits that the petitioner has nothing to do with the present crime, and his name has been involved only on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused Vipin Kumar, though no amount was transferred in the bank account of the petitioner. Another co-accused Suraj, whose name was also mentioned in the FIR, has already been granted anticipatory bail by co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 27.01.2022, passed in CRM-M-14106-2021 (Annexure P-2). Moreover, the offences in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate. The petitioner is in custody since 09.01.2025. Thus, prays for grant of bail.

3. On advance notice and in response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is habitual offender, who is committing such offences on regular intervals through his network in the same area. However, he does not deny the fact that the petitioner was nominated as co-accused in the present case on the disclosure statement of main accused Vipin Kumar.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance, this Court finds



substance in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner by observing that the petitioner was nominated in the present case on the disclosure statement of main accused Vipin Kumar. No amount is alleged to have been transferred in the bank account of the petitioner. There is no denial that another co-accused Suraj Kumar, who was also nominated as accused in the present case, and similarly situated like the petitioner, has already been granted concession of anticipatory bail by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court. The offences in the present case are triable by the Court of Magistrate. The petitioner is inside jail since 09.01.2025 and a period of 10 months has already passed. The trial may take some time to conclude, and liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed.

5. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis



CRM-M-55728-2025

4

of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE**

**October 13, 2025**

Pk Kapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**