

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

CRM-M-12758 of 2016

Date of Decision: November 22, 2016

Ranjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Ms. Satwant Mehta, Advocate with
Mr. Amaninder Preet, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. C.S. Brar, DAG, Punjab.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

This regular bail application under Section 439 Cr.P.C. which was considered so when the same was presented before the Administrative Judge by the petitioner and the present one is 3rd regular bail application of the petitioner Ranjit Singh @ Rana as admittedly the earlier two applications stand dismissed by this Court.

The allegations against the petitioner are that he along with his co-accused over a dispute of agricultural piece of land entered into a quarrel on 23.6.2014 with complainant Amrik Singh and his son Amandeep Singh (now deceased), where Harjit Singh, Avtar Singh, Nirvail Singh and Harpal Singh were present. It is during the course of intervention by the respectables it is alleged that Sardara Singh raised *lalkara* on which incitement it is alleged that Joginder Singh @ Lalla and Baldev Singh @

Deba went inside their house and brought out 12 bore DBBL guns and while the complainant side tried to flee their way was blocked and the accused side fired hitting Amandeep Singh who died instantaneously causing life endangering injuries to others. It is at that point of time when Avtar Singh, Narvail Singh and Harpal Singh tried to escape on motorcycle that they were stopped from doing so by the accused side including the present petitioner.

The contentions of the learned counsel for the petitioner that co-accused Sardara Singh was allowed similar relief vide orders dated 25.5.2015 and Joginder Singh @ Lalla vide orders dated 03.08.2016 and that on account of principle of parity the petitioner has sought the same relief which is stoutly opposed by the learned State counsel.

The bail application of the petitioner was considered at length vide orders dated 11.03.2016 of this Court and for the reasons detailed therein the same was declined. No fresh ground necessitating allowing of the bail to the petitioner is made out nor could be impressed upon this Court by the counsel for the petitioner. Thus, finding no merit the present petition stands dismissed.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

November 22, 2016
aarti

Whether speaking/reasoned : No
Whether reportable : Yes