



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

222

CRM-M-28569-2025

Date of decision: May 28th, 2025

Gurdeep Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate
with Mr. Ashish Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail in FIR No.10 dated 21.02.2023 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 472, 473, 474, 489, 379 read with Section 34 of the IPC 1860, at Police Station Kacha Pakka, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR in question was registered way back in February 2023. The petitioner was neither named therein nor any suspicion raised qua his involvement in the crime in question. It is after almost two years that the petitioner was arrested on 12.04.2025 on the basis of a statement suffered by one Tosar Rao, who claimed that the petitioner was also part of the gang, which had been indulging in sale and purchase of stolen vehicles. Learned counsel has submitted that the inordinate delay in nominating the petitioner as an accused in the present case, coupled with the fact that petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents, clearly points to his

innocence and false implication in the present case. It has been further submitted that the entire case of the prosecution is based on documentary evidence, which is already part of the challan, which was presented on 17.04.2025.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite. However, on instructions from ASI Gurmeet Singh, he has not disputed the stage of trial nor has he disputed the custody period of the petitioner. Learned State counsel has reiterated the allegations levelled in the FIR, which is annexed as Annexure P-1, to the effect that the petitioner along with co-accused had been purchasing stolen luxury cars and after changing their number plates, tampering with the chassis number etc., they had been preparing fake documents and thereafter putting them up for sale for prospective buyers. However, learned State counsel has not disputed that the entire case against the petitioner is based on documentary evidence, which is part of the challan. It has also not been disputed that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material placed on record.

5. In a magisterial trial, the petitioner has been in custody since 12.04.2025. The possibility of the trial concluding in the near future seems unlikely as charges are yet to be framed and as many as 21 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution. Concededly, the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner be admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However,

it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. Needless to say, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

May 28th, 2025
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No