



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

Date of Decision:-03.09.2025

CRM-M-16943-2024

Pritpal Singh @ Preet.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

AND

CRM-M-29887-2025

Bahadur Singh @ Lovedeep Singh.

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

State of Punjab.

.....Respondent.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate with
Mr. Karan Pathak, Advocate for the Petitioner
(in CRM-M-16943-2024).

Mr. Lalit Singla, Advocate &
Ms. Varsha Sharma, Advocate for the Petitioner
(in CRM-M-29887-2025).

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Sant Pal Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the Complainant.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

By this common order I shall dispose of both the
aforementioned petitions as the same have arisen out of one and the same



FIR.

2. The prayer in both these petitions under Section 439 Cr.PC is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.38 dated 06.04.2022 under Sections 302, 148, 149 and 34 IPC and Section 25, 27 & 30 of Arms Act, 1954 registered at Police Station Urban Estate Patiala, District Patiala.

3. The brief facts of the case are that statement of one Jugandeep Singh was recorded to the effect that he had graduated from Khalsa College, Patiala in 2018. One Harvir Singh was the president of Student Organization in Punjabi University, Patiala. Prior to the occurrence a quarrel had taken place between him (complainant) and Harvir Singh. On 5.4.2022 while he (complainant) was standing in front of Butter Stup Pizza Hut restaurant then Harvir Singh along with Tejinder Singh Fauji came there and started abusing him. Thereafter Harvir Singh left the place on his motor cycle and came back on motor cycle accompanied by two persons namely Bonny and Harman. On seeing them he (complainant) stayed in his car parked nearby. Thereafter Harvir, Tejinder Singh, Bonny and Harman surrounded his car. Harvir was holding a pistol in his hands and started threatening him. On seeing the altercation his (complainant's) friend Gurjinder Singh the owner of the restaurant called Dharminder Singh @ Bhinda his (complainant's) friend, who tried to convince Harvir Singh and his companions. After sometime, Tejinder Singh Fauji raised a *lalkara* that they be not spared. Thereafter Tejinder Singh Fauji, Harvir Singh, Bonny and Harman started firing shots with their pistols and they (complainant party) started running to save themselves. Then Harvir Singh fired a shot towards Dharaminder Singh which struck his back and he fell into an empty plot. On his (complainant's) screaming many people came out of the PG



accommodations situated near the spot after which the accused ran away. Dharminder Singh died due to a gunshot injury.

4. The Counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. They have not been named in the FIR but only in the supplementary statement of complainant-Jugandeep Singh. Complainant-Jugandeep Singh has been examined as PW-1. In his cross examination, while looking at the video of the place of the occurrence, he has admitted that the petitioners were not visible in the same but they were present at the spot. As they are in custody since 09.04.2022 but only 02 of the 33 Pws have been examined so far, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, they are entitled to the concession of bail.

5. The Counsel for the State and the counsel for the complainant on the other hand contend that though the petitioners are not named in the FIR, they are named in the supplementary statement of the complainant. The nature of the allegations levelled against them do not entitle them to the concession of bail. However, they concede that the petitioners are in custody since 09.04.2022 and that only 02 of the 33 Pws have been examined so far.

6. I have heard counsel for the parties.

7. Admittedly, the petitioners are not named in the FIR but in the supplementary statement of the complainant. Their culpability shall be established during the course of the Trial after the evidence of other material witnesses is recorded. They have been in custody for the last more than 03 years and 04 months. Only 02 of the 33 Pws have been examined so far. Therefore, the Trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon. In this situation, their further incarceration is not required.

8. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present



petitions are allowed and the petitioners-**Pritpal Singh @ Preet** son of Sh. Gurmeet Singh and **Bahadur Singh @ Lovedeep Singh** son of Sh. Jaggu Singh are ordered to be released on bail subject to their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

9. The petitioners shall appear before the police station concerned on the first Monday of every month till the conclusion of the trial and inform in writing each time that they are not involved in any other crime other case.

10. If the petitioners or any of their family members/associates make any attempt to contact/threaten/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of their bail granted by this Court.

11. In addition the petitioners (or anyone on their behalf) shall prepare an FDR in the sum of Rs.1,00,000/- each and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioners from trial without sufficient cause.

12. The petitions stand disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

September 03, 2025
Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No