



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

CRM-M-9664-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 28.04.2025

Ravinder Singh @ Raja @ Malhi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Amardeep Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of present fourth petition praying for granting regular bail in case FIR No.161 dated 01.06.2022 under Section 307, 302, 148, 149, 379-B, 120-B, 201 IPC and Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Cantonment Police Commissionerate Amritsar, District Amritsar.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Lakhwinder Singh. It was alleged that on 01.06.2022, he received an information that his son Lovepreet Singh (deceased) and his friend Gursimran Singh had received fire arm injuries and they were admitted in Amandeep Hospital. On receiving the information, the complainant alongwith his relatives reached Amandeep Hospital, where he found that his son Lovepreet Singh already died during treatment. On enquiry, he came to know that Gursimran Singh was having friendship with one girl, namely, Simran Bala, due to which there occurred a quarrel with Gurjit Singh @ Gurjant, Manjinder Singh, Guri, Ravinder Singh (petitioner) and their two unknown associates and on



account of the same, the fire arm injuries to his son Lovepreet Singh and his friend Gursimran Singh were inflicted. Request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 16.06.2022. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 22.09.2022. Thereafter, the petitioner approached this Court thrice before this Court, however, all the bail petitions filed by the petitioners were allowed to dismissed as withdrawn. Hence, the petitioner has again approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present fourth petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that from the allegations made in the FIR, crux of the whole case as alleged is that Gursimran Singh was having friendship with one girl Simran Bala. It is submitted that during the investigation, it has been found that deceased Lovepreet Singh was fired upon by Jagjeet Singh @ Jota, whereas, against the petitioner, allegations are to the effect that he exhorted the co-accused to fire at the deceased. It is submitted that the allegations made against the petitioner are false and frivolous on the face of it, even otherwise the petitioner neither was armed with any weapon nor he has played any overt act. It is submitted that the investigation is completed and charges are framed and out of 47 prosecution witnesses, 03 witnesses including the material witnesses i.e. the complainant and eye witness have



also been examined. He submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and thus, he deserves to be granted bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR alongwith the co-accused being part of the unlawful assembly and thus, was actively involved in the commission of offence. It is submitted that the petitioner who exhorted the co-accused to fire upon the deceased and during the investigation mobile phone of the deceased was also recovered from him. On instructions, he submits that out of total 47 prosecution witnesses, only 03 witnesses have been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is inferred that the FIR was lodged by the father of the deceased. The allegations primarily against the petitioner are regarding exhortation of co-accused by him. As reflected from the custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years 10 months & 04 days as on 26.04.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

6. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. 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.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion



CRM-M-9664-2025

-4-

on the merits of the case.

9. In view of the above order, CRM-14375-2025 praying for interim bail to the petitioner, stands infructuous.

	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)	
	JUDGE	
28.04.2025	Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
sharmila	Whether Reportable :	Yes/No