



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

CRM-M-15056-2025

Reserved on: 14th May, 2025

Pronounced on: 19th May, 2025

Rajdeep Singh @ Raja

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Jagjit Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
136	23.10.2024	Dera Baba Nanak, Batala, District Gurdaspur	109, 111 and 308 (4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”) (111 (5) and 112 of BNS added later on) and 25 of the Arms Act, 1959

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement got recorded by the complainant Randeep Singh, alleging therein that on 23.10.2024, he along with his assistant Akash was present in his medical store, when one youth reached there and gave him a signal to come to him and when the complainant reached near him, he took out a pistol and fired a shot towards the complainant thereby injuring his left thigh. The complainant raised clamour and on hearing the same, his brother rushed for his rescue and then the assailant fled away. After registration of FIR,



investigation proceedings were initiated. During investigation, a secret information was received that the accused Anmoldeep Singh was the person who had made an attempt to murder the victim and after the occurrence, co-accused Manjit Kaur, who is mother of the above said accused along with her husband had provided shelter and motor bike to the accused and they were fully aware about the incident. Offence under Section 111(5) of BNS was added. The petitioner was nominated as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Anmoldeep Singh. He was arrested on 03.11.2024. Investigation now stands concluded.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the allegations that at the time of commission of subject offences, he had conducted reiki of the complainant at the asking of co-accused Jeewan Fozzi and had assisted in commission of organized crime of extortion. The disclosure statement suffered by the co-accused cannot be admissible against him. He does not have any criminal antecedents. He is in custody since long. Co-accused Baljit Singh, Balbir Singh, Manjit Kaur, Kamaljeet Singh and Navtej Singh, whose case was on similar footing, have been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be released on bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. 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, who being a member of an organized gang, conducted reiki of the complainant on asking of the accused Jeewan @ Fozzi. He alongwith the co-accused runs extortion rackets. There are chances of his



intimidating the witnesses or absconding, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

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

6. The petitioner is alleged to be a member of a gang of extortionist headed by accused Jeewan @ Fozi, who is stated to be in custody, as per the allegations, that he had done reiki of the complainant before attempt to kill him, had been made by the co-accused. He is in custody since 03.11.2024. Trial is likely to take time. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Co-accused, against whom similar allegations have been levelled, have already been granted concession of bail by this Court. Keeping in view the nature of allegations as levelled against the petitioner, the period of his incarceration, the fact that he does not have any criminal antecedents coupled with the fact that the trial would take time as well as the co-accused have been granted bail, I am of the considered opinion that he deserves to be released on bail. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

19th May, 2025

Parveen Sharma

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

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