

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

CNR NO: PHHC010700742026
2026.PHHC:099937-DB



212

CRA-D-750-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21.07.2026

JUGRAJ SINGH @ SONY

...Appellant

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present: Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, Advocate, for the appellant.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

CRM-19476-2026

Prayer in the application is for condonation of delay of 9 days in filing the appeal.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 9 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

CRM-19475-2026

Present application has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, praying for dispensing with the filing of certified copy of impugned order dated 17.03.2026 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur (Punjab), along with Annexures A-1/T to A-4.

Allowed as prayed for.

Main case

1. The appellant has preferred the present appeal against the order dated 17.03.2026 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur, vide which the bail application of the appellant in case FIR No.8 dated 12.02.2025, registered under Sections 192 and 61(2) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 153 and 120-B of IPC) and Section 10 and 13 of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 at Police Station Dharamgarh, District Sangrur, Punjab, has been dismissed.

2. As per version of the prosecution, on 12.02.2025, SI/SHO Gurpal Singh, accompanied by other police officials was present at Bus Stand, Satauj, in connection with patrolling and checking of suspects when at about 02:30 P.M., he received the secret information that slogans regarding Khalistan had been written on the wall of Electricity Grid situated on Tolawal Road at village Satauj and a yellow coloured flag on which 'Deg Teg Fateh' and 'Khanda' was printed and words 'Khalistan Jindabad' were written, had been hanged at an angle on the wall. In this context, Gurpatwant Singh Pannu SFJ had already made a video viral on social media platform, via which fear was generated in the mind of general public and bitterness was created in different communities, peace was disturbed in the State and the law and order could have deteriorated from the same. The slogans were then got removed and flag was taken into police possession. On 16.02.2025, DSP Prithvi Singh Chahal was present at Bus Stand Satauj where secret informer informed him that Jugraj Singh @ Sony (appellant herein) and Gurmeet Singh @ Gitti had committed the above-mentioned offence and they had come on a motorcycle, pursuant to which,

Gurmit Singh @ Gitti was arrested on 17.02.2025 and on 18.02.2025, production warrants of Jugraj Singh, who was confined in jail at Mansa, were sought and he was arrested as well. He disclosed that he was confined in a rape case at Bathinda jail, where he met Amritpal Singh son of Paramjit Singh and Baljit Singh @ Prabhu and they often had discussions. Amritpal Singh disclosed that he was Pro Khalistani and that he used to write slogans in favour of Khalistan on government walls for which he received money from abroad and in case, if the appellant did that work on being released, he would get Rs.20,000/- for the said work. One Baljit Singh @ Prabhu was sent to Faridkot jail and he was released on parole. Amritpal Singh took his mobile no.79730-90410. After his release from jail on parole on 14.01.2025, he received a call from Baljinder Singh from mobile No.76588-93263, who disclosed that he was brother of Amritpal Singh and that they often used to talk on Whatsapp calls. Baljinder Singh told him to perform the work which was given to him by Amritpal Singh and Baljit Singh and he sent the slogans which were to be written and slogans were Khalistan Jindabad SFJ. As per the directions, he further took photo of the same. Baljinder Singh also asked him to write on the wall of government school and he provided him with two cans of black colour and a yellow flag and he also made him talk to Baljit Singh @ Prabhu on a conference call at Faridkot jail and he told him that he would pay him Rs.2000/- for the expenses if he did that work. Gurmeet Singh Gitti then met him in the shop of a doctor to whom he told that he had to get some money from some body and he would pay him Rs.2000/-. Gurmeet Singh Gitti accompanied him to his house. He then reproduced the slogans sent to him on Whatsapp and with muffled faces, they went to village Satauj, where they wrote the slogans on the wall of

Electricity Board, affixed yellow coloured flag and also wrote a slogan on the wall of sheller and made a video. They also took photos of signboard of village Satauj and photos were sent to Baljinder Singh. Appellant then dropped Gurmeet Singh Gitti at his house. He then made Whatsapp call to Baljinder Singh demanding money but latter told him that he would give him as and when he received the same. He then threw the empty cans near the drain which fell near Pippal tree. Accused Jugraj Singh got recovered the Oppo mobile phone which was taken into police possession.

3 Learned counsel appearing for the appellant contends that the role attributed to the appellant was that he had been contacted by certain persons to write Pro Khalistan slogans on the government buildings. It is stated that the appellant had received Rs.20,000/- for the said work. Learned counsel further contends that the appellant was taken into custody on 18.02.2025 and has already undergone an actual custody of more than 01 year and 05 months in the said case. The investigation in the present case is complete. It is contended that apart from empty paint cans, no other recovery had been effected from the appellant. He further contends that co-accused Baljinder Singh, who was alleged to have provided the Khalistani flag as well as cans and also provided details of the government buildings where the slogan of Khalistan Jindabad was to be painted, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 17.03.2026 passed in CRA-D-1508-2025 while the co-accused Atarveer Singh, who had transferred money to the co-accused Gurmeet Singh who accompanied the appellant herein has also been granted concession of regular bail by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 17.03.2026 passed in CRA-D-1051-2025. Counsel contends that the

appellant has not participated in any destructive activities and has at best, painted the slogans with the black paint. The same could at best be a case of defilement of public place and not an offence under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (UAPA). He contends that writing of the slogans of Khalistan Jindabad is not prohibited in law.

4 Learned State counsel on the other hand contends that the appellant is a convict and involved in two other cases and that he, while being in jail, came in contact with the banned outfit 'Sikh for Justice (SFJ)' and the said banned outfit had been regularly carrying out activities so as to create disturbance in the State of Punjab. He , however, does not dispute that the appellant is in custody since 18.02.2025 and the investigation has already been completed. Further, it is also not disputed that apart from defiling the wall of the government building and the allegations of transfer of Rs.20,000/- to the account of the appellant, no other role has been attributed to him.

5 We have heard learned counsel for the parties and taking note of the facts as noticed above, the role attributed to the appellant, the alleged recovery of empty paint cans as well as the period of custody undergone by him and noticing that the investigation in the present case has already been completed and also considering the fact that the co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail, we deem it appropriate to allow the present appeal and the appellant is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

6 It is made clear that the appellant shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

7 The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

8 All pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

21.07.2026
jyoti3

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No