

**CRM-M No. 26549 of 2025 2**

2. Complainant Gurdial Singh got registered the FIR saying that he along with his son Rajwinder Singh @ Raj, Saraj Singh and Gurbhej Singh were travelling in a Verna Car bearing registration No.PB-46-AK-9358, which was driven by Saraj Singh and my son Rajwinder Singh @ Raj was sitting beside him. Complainant himself was sitting on the back seat of driver seat and Gurbhej Singh was sitting on the back seat of his son Rajwinder Singh @ Raj. At about 2:00 pm, when they reached near Gate Baba Bidhi Chand abutting to the Khemkaran Chungi, then three young men came from left side on a motorcycle, whose faces were not covered and by stopping them, two young men sitting on the back seat of motorcycle came down and started firing upon them with their respective pistols. His son Rajwinder Singh @ Raj and Saraj suffered bullet injuries, due to which ultimately Rajwinder Singh @ Raj expired. It is clearly mentioned in the FIR that if the accused, who later-on ran away on their motorcycle, are brought before him, he can identify them.

3. The alleged incident took place on 07.10.2024 and subsequently on 08.10.2024, on the basis of information published at some social media, one more accused Daya Singh @ Preet and 03 other accused were implicated and joined in the investigation through production warrants.

On 25.10.2024, statement of one Suba Singh was recorded under Section 180 of BNSS, wherein he revealed that he had come to know about dropping of the murderers (three motorcyclists) in a car by the present petitioner. As per prosecution investigation, petitioner had gone to his cousin, namely, Balraj Singh (who is also a prosecution witness) and from him he demanded the car to drop some relative.

**CRM-M No. 26549 of 2025 3**

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that from the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the allegations can be converted to that of harbouring the real culprits and, not of playing any active role in committing the murder. There is no evidence with the prosecution and during the course of investigation also, no such evidence is collected by the prosecution that prior to committing murder or at the time of murder, petitioner was party to the common object/common intention or of any conspiracy. The role of the petitioner, as per the prosecution allegation is confined only after the committal of murder by three motorcyclists. Further informs that petitioner is inside jail since 09.11.2024 and out of total 28 prosecution witnesses, only 6 have been examined till date and thus prays for his release on bail.

5. On advance notice and in response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the status report dated 19.08.2025 by way of affidavit of Mr. Lovkesh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub-Division Patti, District Tarn Taran in Court today, which is taken on record. 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 and learned counsel for the complainant while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submit that petitioner himself is party to the conspiracy and is involved in the murder of son of the complainant. Learned counsel for the complainant submits that petitioner Ranjit Singh @ Rana is resident of Ferozepur and he was not expected to be present in Tarn Taran on the day of incident if he was not the party to the crime committed.

**CRM-M No. 26549 of 2025 4**

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance, this Court finds that the submissions addressed by counsel for the petitioner are more impressive. On the other hand, it has not been pointed out by any of the counsel of the respondents that the investigating agency had collected any such evidence, showing involvement of the petitioner, prior to the committal of crime or at the time of committal of crime. For proving the charges, there has to be positive or affirmative evidence with the prosecution which of course if available, can be produced during the course of trial.

8. On the basis of the submissions and the facts recorded hereinabove, be that as it may, I do not find any substantial reason to curtail the liberty of the petitioner for any longer period, looking at the nature of allegations highlighted by the prosecution.

9. In view of totality of circumstances, the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

10. Consequently, 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 hereinabove shall not be construed as an



CRM-M No. 26549 of 2025 5

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.

25.08.2025
Rajeev (rvs)

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes