



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

**CRM-M No.2595 of 2025
Date of decision : 02.09.2025**

Ramandeep Singh Brar @ Ramandeep SinghPetitioner

versus

State of Punjab Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Imaan Singh Khara, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. D. S. Virk, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.133, dated 14.07.2024, under Sections 109 & 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act (later on challan was presented under Sections 109, 3(5), 238, 351(2)(3) of BNS and Section 27 of Arms Act), registered at Police Station City Rajpura, District Patiala, Punjab.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Harwinder Singh. It was alleged that the complainant was working at the liquor vend shop of Inderjit Singh, situated near T-point of Nalas Turn. On 13.07.2024, at about 11:30 P.M., when he along with Parveen Kumar was present in the shop, then two unknown persons came in the car and both of them



demanded for a bottle of liquor. When the complainant asked them to pay money first, due to which, some heated arguments were exchanged between them. Thereafter, a person, who wearing white shirt, took out a pistol from his pocket and fired upon the complainant, which hit on the back side of his left shoulder and thus, the complainant fell down. Thereafter, both the unknown persons fled away from the spot after extending threats to kill them. Thus the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, name of the petitioner surfaced and thus, he was arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 31.08.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 26.11.2024. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that the occurrence in the present case has taken place on 13.07.2024 in a wine shop. He has submitted that the petitioner has not been named in the FIR, however as per the case of prosecution, two boys had come at the wine shop and out of which, one of the boys had fired upon the complainant, which hit him on his left shoulder. He has submitted that even otherwise, the allegations regarding the firing is



against the co-accused, namely, Deepak Kumar. He has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since 31.08.2024. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the complainant-injured has been examined before the learned trial Court as PW-1 and he has not supported the case of prosecution and thus, he has turned hostile. He has submitted that though the petitioner is involved in 03 other cases, however he is on bail in all the cases. He has submitted that false implication of the petitioner is writ large. He has thus submitted that the material witnesses, i.e. the injured-complainant has already been examined, who has not supported the case of prosecution and turned hostile, thus the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has affirmed the submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner that the complainant has not supported the case of prosecution.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that the petitioner along with the co-accused, namely, Deepak had fired upon the complainant and the weapon of the offence belongs to the petitioner. She, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 32 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined till date. She has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in this case on



31.08.2024 and since then he is behind bars. As submitted before this Court that the complainant-injured has not supported the case of prosecution. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year as on 01.09.2025. Custody Certificate further shows that the petitioner is involved in 03 other cases, however in two of the cases, he is on bail. Out of 32 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been examined till date.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

9. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case. However, if the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in this case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

02.09.2025

<i>rittu</i>	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No