



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-21236-2025
Decided on : 25.09.2025

Bikramjit Singh @ Bikka . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. ADS Jattana, Advocate and
Mr. Mandeep Singh Gill, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Bikramjit Singh @ Bikka	346	21.12.2023	307, 324, 34 of IPC, 1860 and 25, 34 of Arms Act, 1959	City Tarn Taran	Taran Taran

2. Incident in question took place on 21.12.2023 at GS Service Station, Village Malia, when complainant – Gurpreet Singh, was accompanying Akashdeep Singh and Jagroop Singh in his Scorpio car bearing registration No. CH01-AG-7128. As per the FIR, four unknown persons arrived there in a white Swift car, out of which three persons alighted. One of them, armed with a pistol, fired a shot which hit the steering wheel of the car and also caused injury to the hand of complainant Gurpreet Singh. The other two accused, including the present petitioner



(though not named in the FIR), were allegedly carrying double barrel guns, though none of them is alleged to have used the same.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, while referring to para 8 of the impugned order dated 30.07.2024 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned Trial Court, points out that subsequent to registration of the FIR, the names of all accused, namely (i) Jobanjeet Singh @ Joban, (ii) Amritpal Singh @ Amrit, and (iii) Bikramjeet Singh @ Bikka (**petitioner herein**), were disclosed only on the ground that the complainant, on his own, investigated the matter and then came to know about the names of the assailants.

4. Learned counsel further argues that a supplementary statement was recorded vide Rapat No. 51 dated 05.02.2024, i.e., after a delay of about one and a half months. The petitioner – Bikramjit Singh @ Bikka, along with co-accused Amritpal Singh @ Amrit, is alleged to have been armed with 12 bore rifles, but there is no allegation of their having fired or used the said weapons. The injury to the complainant is attributed only to the pistol fire allegedly by co-accused Jobanjeet Singh @ Joban, and that too on a non-vital part.

It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 05.04.2024, i.e., for the last about 01 year, 05 months and 18 days. Though investigation has already been completed and challan presented, the process of recording prosecution evidence has not yet commenced. In these circumstances, considering the nature of allegations, absence of specific role, and the period of incarceration already undergone, prayer is made for grant of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, the learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 23.09.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to



all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, is unable to dispute the factual aspects as argued by learned counsel for the petitioner. He, however, points out that apart from the instant case, the petitioner is also involved in two other cases of similar nature, and therefore, being a habitual offender, does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. In response, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in none of these cases – i.e. (i) FIR No.101 dated 28.08.2021 under Sections 307, 457, 380, 148, 149 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Patti, District Tarn Taran, and (ii) FIR No.160 dated 02.10.2022 under Sections 307, 326, 336, 427, 452, 506, 148, 149, 201 IPC and Sections 25/27 of the Arms Act, registered at Police Station City Patti, District Tarn Taran – name of the petitioner finds mention at the very first instance. It is only subsequently by recording a supplementary statement on 05.02.2024, in the present case that the petitioner is shown as accused in the other cases, also.

Learned State counsel is unable to dispute this factual assertion as well.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the record, and examined the circumstances in their entirety.

9. At this stage, no conclusive opinion can be expressed on the factual aspects, as the same would cause prejudice to either side. However, it cannot go unnoticed that the petitioner, though alleged to be armed, is not



attributed with the role of firing any shot. Thus, whether there was any intention to commit murder would be a moot question for consideration at trial. Further, petitioner has already been in custody for about 01 year, 05 months and 18 days, and the prosecution evidence has not yet commenced. In these circumstances, I deem it appropriate to consider the prayer for bail.

10. Accordingly, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

13. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 25, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No