

2025:PHHC:084392



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

312

**CRM-M No.29087 of 2025  
Date of decision: 11.07.2025**

Ramanjot Singh @ Ramandeep Singh ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Vijay Singh, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,  
for the respondent-State.

----

**MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking anticipatory bail in cross case bearing G.D. No.24 dated 13.08.2024 registered under Sections 109, 115(2) and (5), 191(3) and 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (For short ‘BNS’) (Sections 118(2) and 117(2) of BNS added later on) at Police Station Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib arising out of FIR No.95 dated 13.08.2024 under Sections 109, 333, 191(3) and 190 of BNS and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Fatehgarh Sahib, District Fatehgarh Sahib.

2025:PHHC:084392



2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Gurjeet Kaur alleging that on 29.05.2024, Gurvinder Singh husband of her daughter Sahibjit Kaur had assaulted her in the presence of her son Ramanjot Singh i.e. the petitioner. Gurjeet Kaur had brought her daughter to her house. On 12.08.2024, Gurvinder Singh came to the house of the complainant along with some unknown persons and Prabhdeep Singh. Gurwinder Singh fired a shot with intent to kill Gurjeet Kaur. The same hit her left thigh. The assailants also made an attempt to kill her by firing shots but she managed to save herself. The injured Gurjeet Kaur was admitted to hospital. On her complaint, the aforementioned FIR was registered. On 13.08.2024, a GD No.24 was entered on the basis of statement recorded by Gurwinder Singh alleging that on 12.08.2024, he along with his cousin Prabhdeep Singh and some other persons had gone to his in-laws house. His mother-in-law Gurjeet Kaur had opened the gate and had strated abusing them. He wanted to bring his wife Sahibjit Kaur back to his home but Gurjeet Kaur and the petitioner who were mother and brother respectively of his wife, started extending beatings to Prabhdeep Singh after hurling abuses. The petitioner hit Prabhdeep Singh on head with a rod. The victim had started bleeding and was taken to hospital. A cross case under Sections 109, 115(2) and (5), 191(3) and 190 of BNS was registered. Investigation proceedings have been initiated and are

2025:PHHC:084392



underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved application for grant of pre arrest bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib vide order dated 24.12.2024.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. His sister Sahibjit Kaur was married with Gurwinder Singh (complainant in cross case) who is a drug addict and who treated her with cruelty. On 29.05.2024, she was brought back to her parental home. On 12.08.2024 Gurwinder Singh had come to their house along with Prabhdeep Singh and some other unknown persons. He had fired a shot which had hit his mother and she was badly injured. Despite being victims, they have been falsely implicated by getting a cross case registered. No specific injury has been attributed to him. His custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from him. The co-accused Gurjeet Kaur, Satbir Singh and Jaspal Singh have been extended benefit of bail. A compromise has been effected between the parties and the complainant party has agreed to get the FIR quashed against the petitioner and the co-accused. No case for commission of subject offences has been made out as against the petitioner. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre arrest bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner as in connivance with the co-accused, he had caused

2025:PHHC:084392



an injury with an iron dah on head of the victim Prabhdeep Singh. This injury was on vital part of the body and was opined to be grievous in nature. He also tried to run over Gurwinder Singh, husband of his sister with his Verna car. Gurwinder Singh sustained seven injuries. The weapon used in the offence is to be recovered from him. His custodial interrogation is required for conducting thorough investigation in the matter. No authenticity can be attached to the compromise alleged to be effected between the victims and the petitioner at this stage. Proceedings for declaring the petitioner as a proclaimed person have been initiated on 16.06.2025 as the petitioner is avoiding his arrest since long. It is, therefore, argued that he does not deserve to be extended benefit of pre arrest bail.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have caused simple as well as grievous injuries to the victim Prabhdeep Singh and Gurwinder Singh though the mother of the petitioner is also alleged to have sustained injuries in the same incident. However, it is a matter of evidence as to who was the aggressor. The injuries attributed to the petitioner have been opined to be serious in nature. No authenticity can be attached to the compromise Annexure P-8 which is placed on record by the petitioner and its genuineness has to be determined at the appropriate stage by the trial Court on thorough assessment of the

2025:PHHC:084392



evidence to be produced on record. For conducting thorough investigation in the matter, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. It is well settled law that powers for grant of pre arrest bail are to be exercised in extraordinary and sparing circumstances. No such circumstance is made out in this case. Even otherwise proclamation proceedings have already been initiated against the petitioner. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

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

11.07.2025  
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No