



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

226-2

CRM-M-15122-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.08.2025

SATYAVARANJIT SINGH ALIAS SATTA

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Varinder Basa, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure (now Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023), seeking regular bail in FIR No.99 dated 31.05.2024 under Sections 302, 307, 34, 120-B IPC, 1860 and Sections 25, 54, 59 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar-Rural, Punjab.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 02 persons came on motorcycle make Splendor and stopped their motorcycle in the outer lane of the haveli. The pillion rider of the said motorcycle came down and exhorted that Deepinder Singh be not spared. Then they took out pistols and fired several shots on Deepinder Singh with an intention to kill him. In this incident, Sukhcharanjit Singh, Major Singh, Sawaran Singh and Sandeep Singh were also injured during the firing. The present petitioner has been named by the complainant as being conspirator of the occurrence.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has



been falsely implicated in the present case. He further states that the petitioner has undergone a custody period of 09 months and 30 days and trial in the present case is yet to commence.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner has undergone a custody period of 09 months and 30 days and the trial is yet to commence.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Apart from the supplementary statement of the complainant, there is no recovery or any other evidence against the petitioner to connect him with the said crime. Admittedly, the petitioner was not present at the spot of occurrence when the firing had taken place. Keeping in view the above and that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is 09 months and 0 days; the trial is yet to commence, since the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned. The



pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

19th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

**(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No