



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

223

CRM-M-7073-2025

Date of decision: 14th May, 2025

Jaswant Singh @ Jassa

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sidhant Vermani, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 115 dated 05.09.2024 registered under Sections 103(1), 190, 191(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Khalra, District Tarn Taran.

2. Adumbrated facts as emanating from the record are that on 04.09.2024, the complainant Roop Singh was present in his house along with his family members, when the accused Rajan Sharma, Sajan Sharma, Sukhdev Singh and Anju Rani came to his house in a car. Rajan Sharma was carrying a 12 bore gun belonging to Raj Singh Pradhan. All of them insisted Nishan Singh, nephew of the complainant to accompany them for attending a function at the house of Gurlal Singh, resident of village Khalra. Nishan



Singh was initially reluctant but later on, he agreed and went along with them in their car. On the same night at about 9:40 PM, the complainant received a call from Rajan Sharma to the effect that pellets of 12 bore gun had injured Nishan singh. On receipt of this information, the complainant along with his family members rushed towards the house of Gurlal Singh and found the victim Nishan Singh to be lying in the courtyard in an injured condition. He was rushed to the hospital but was declared to be brought dead. The complainant alleged that the above named Rajan Sharma, Sajan Sharma and Sukhdev with whom the victim Nishan Singh had an altercation about one year back and who had motive to kill the victim, had committed murder of the victim.

3. On the aforementioned complaint, FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated. Post-mortem examination of the dead body of the victim was conducted. Accused Rajan Sharma was arrested on 08.09.2024. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement admitting his involvement in the crime and also disclosed about the complicity of the present petitioner and other co-accused. He disclosed that as per the plan, the petitioner along with some unknown youths had gone to the house of Gurlal Singh where initially fire works were used and then after shooting the victim and leaving him injured, all of them had left the spot. The petitioner was arrested on 16.09.2024. He too suffered disclosure statement and admitted his involvement in the crime. The co-accused were also arrested. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has



been falsely implicated in this case. He was nominated in this case after a delay of 20 days from the date of commission of the offence. He has nothing to do with the occurrence. He had no motive to kill the victim. As per the allegations, he had only made an exhortation and it was the co-accused Rajan, who had fired shot at the victim on the fateful day. His name has been taken on the basis of suspicion. Trial is likely to take considerable time. No direct evidence has been collected to connect him with the murder of the victim. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding. Accordingly, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. It is argued by learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. Infact, he was the prime accused, who had asked the co-accused to invite the victim to a party at the house of Gurlal Singh and had fired shot with firearm upon the victim. Trial has commenced and is going at a proper pace. There is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial. Material witnesses are yet to be examined. He has criminal antecedents since one more criminal case has been registered against him. Accordingly, it is urged that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

7. The petitioner alongwith the co-accused is alleged to have committed the murder of the victim. The material witnesses included eye-witnesses are yet to be examined. Specific acts have been attributed to him



and he is alleged to be master mind of the crime. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail 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 does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

14th May, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No