



CRM-M-11326 of 2025

-1-

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

221

CRM-M-11326 of 2025

Date of Decision: 09.07.2025

Daljit Singh @ Major Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Manisha Batra, J.(Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 (for short-‘BNSS’) is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.125 dated 11.08.2023 under Sections 420 and 201 of the IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Bhikhiwind, District Tarn Taran.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the complaint filed by the complainant-Jaspreet Singh alleging that Daljit Singh who is related with him and his daughter Karam Kaur had represented to him that the petitioner-Daljit Singh was having links with influential persons and could get him recruited in a job in Punjab Police. They induced them to give a sum of Rs.7½ lakhs for getting him appointed in Police Department. On being so induced, he himself gave a sum of Rs.4.5 lakhs and his brother-



CRM-M-11326 of 2025

-2-

in-law gave a sum of Rs.3 lakhs for securing jobs in Police Department. The petitioner and his daughter took money in the presence of Kahan Singh and Surjit Singh and assured to get the complainant and his brother-in-law appointed. However they could not do so and when the complainant demanded the money from them, they flatly refused to return the same.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 01.09.2024. The offence under Section 201 of IPC was added. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since 03.09.2024. The subject offences are triable by Magistrate. The trial is likely to take time. He is not involved in any other similar matter. His involvement in a case under NDPS Act cannot be considered to be a ground for denying the benefit of bail to him. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody any more. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding, therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has resisted the prayer made by the petitioner in terms of the status report filed by the respondent-State by arguing that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner. He was a habitual offender as he is also involved in another case registered under NDPS Act. He duped the complainant for huge amount of money. There are chances of petitioner's absconding or intimidating the witnesses if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, he does not deserve to be extended the benefit of regular bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and



CRM-M-11326 of 2025

-3-

perused the material placed on record.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have cheated the complainant by inducing him to part with a sum of Rs.4 lakhs on the pretext that he would get him appointed in a Government job in Police Department. He is in custody since 03.09.2024. Investigation stands completed. No prosecution witness has been examined so far and therefore, the trial will obviously take time to conclude. His further detention would not serve any useful purpose. No recovery has been effected from him. Merely because of his involvement in another criminal case, he cannot be denied the benefit of regular bail in this case.

8. Keeping in view the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the nature of subject offence, and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, I am of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence, the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the extent of two sureties to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

09.07.2025

D.Bansal

**(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No
Whether Reportable : Yes/ No