



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

233

CRM-M-14280-2025

Date of decision: 16th May, 2025

Paramjit Singh @ Pamma @ Raj Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Rajpal Singh Kalra, Advocate for the petitioner.
(through video conferencing mode)

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. seeking regular bail in DDR No. 26 dated 23.10.2023 registered under Sections 307, 506, 148, 149 of IPC, 1860 and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 in FIR No. 148 dated 20.10.2023 under Sections 302, 404, 341, 148 and 149 of IPC, 1860 and Section 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Kot Ise Khan.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by complainant Kulwinder Kaur, resident of village Khosa Kotla, District Moga alleging therein that on 20.10.2023, at about 7:00 AM, her father-in-law namely Veer Singh, Sarpanch, Ranjeet Singh, Major Singh, Taranjit Singh @ Tarna, Piara Singh, Dev Singh and



Balwinder Singh were going on Galoti road in routine manner. Complainant along with her sister-in-law(*Jethani*) Karamjit Kaur was also going for morning walk and were following above named persons. When they reached near the electric motor of Nirmal Singh @ Nimma, the above named Veer Singh etc. were intercepted by occupants of two cars and 3-4 motorcycles 14-15 persons alighted from the same and after crossing the complainant and her companions, they rounded up Veer Singh and the persons who were going along with him. They had opened an assault upon them with firearms which they were carrying. She alleged that Sukhdev Singh fired a shot which hit the head of her father-in-law Veer Singh and Gurdeep Singh had fired shot hitting in the stomach of Ranjit Singh. Both of them had fallen on the ground. Ranjit Singh had also given a blow with baseball on the head of Taranjit Singh. They raised hue and cry and then the assailants fled away from the spot. They had brought the victim Veer Singh and Ranjit Singh to the hospital but they were declared to be dead. On these allegations, a case bearing FIR No. 148 was registered on the same day and the investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. On 30.10.2023, a DDR No. 26 was got entered on the basis of a statement recorded by Surinderjit Singh @ Chindi alleging therein that on 20.10.2023 at about 7:00 AM, he along with his father Sukhdev Singh @ Gurcharan Singh, Malkiat Singh, Ranjit Singh @ Jeet, Sohan Singh and one more person were going in their alto car bearing No. PB-29M-6465 and when they reached at Galoti Road, they found Veer Singh, Ranjit Singh, Taranjit Singh, Dev Singh, Piara Singh and Balwinder Singh to be sitting on the motor pump of Nimma. 14-15 persons were also standing there on



motorcycles. They were armed with weapons. He alleged that heated words were exchanged between them and then Taranjit Singh had a scuffle with the complainant Surinderjit Singh. Accused Taranjit Singh had directed Veer Singh to fire a shot while pointing towards Surinderjit Singh stood in front of his father to save him and the bullet hit his right shoulder and another bullet hit his neck and he has fallen down. Then his (Surinderjit Singh's) father Gurcharan Singh had also fired a shot which had hit the head of Veer Singh. Veer Singh had also fired shots and in the scuffle, Ranjit Singh had sustained firearm injury in his abdomen. The DDR was initially registered under Sections 307, 506, 148 and read with Section 149 of IPC and Section 27 of Arms Act and is in custody since 10.11.2023. Investigation now stands concluded.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He was not named in the FIR or in the cross version. He is in custody since long. Trial would take considerable time to conclude. Neither any injury has been attributed to him, nor his active participation in the occurrence has been alleged. The allegations that the pistol of the victim was in his custody are totally baseless. A false recovery has been planted upon him. No purpose would be served by his further incarceration. The co-accused Taranjit Singh has already been extended benefit of bail. The case of the petitioner is even at better footage. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, has argued that keeping in view the



gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

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

7. The co-accused have been facing trial on the allegations that they had made an attempt to kill the complainant by forming membership of an unlawful assembly, however, the allegations against the petitioner are that he had taken into his custody, the pistol of victim Veer Singh at the time of occurrence and had concealed the same. The said pistol is alleged to be have been recovered at his instance. He is in custody since long. Keeping in view the above discussed facts, on parity, but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that given the nature of the allegations, the petitioner makes out a case for release on bail. Accordingly the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

16th May, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*