



CRM-M-29985-2025

1

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

250

**CRM-M-29985-2025  
Decided on :25.07.2025**

Pritpal Singh @ Gora

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Mr. Shivender Pal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.132 dated 30.09.2024, under Sections 109, 325(4), 324(4) of BNS and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act (Sections 249, 253, 308(4), 351(1), 61(2) of BNS were added later on), registered at Police Station PS Machhiwara, Police District Khanna, Ludhiana.

2. As per the case of the prosecution, one Komalpreet and Billa intended to eliminate the complainant, Baldev Singh (the lodger of the FIR), and for this purpose, they hired the services of contract killers, namely Pritpal Singh(petitioner herein) ,Jarmanjit Singh @ Jerry, Gurpreet Singh, and Gurtej Singh. It is alleged that petitioner Pritpal Singh was driving the car at the time of the incident, while the accused Jarmanjit Singh @ Jerry, who was seated in the front of the passenger seat, fired a shot with a pistol. The bullet passed through the right side of the complainant's neck, exited from the left side of his neck and



thereafter got lodged in his mobile phone, which was attached to his left ear.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody for the period of last nine months and nine days. Out of a total of 20 prosecution witnesses, none have been examined till date, although charges have already been framed. Counsel further submits that the allegations levelled by the prosecution are yet to be proved, including whether or not, there is any direct connection between the present petitioner and other co-accused namely, Komalpreet Singh and Billa, who allegedly intended to eliminate the complainant, Baldev Singh. It is also submitted that the prosecution's case relies primarily on conversation through social media i.e. Instagram and Snapchat, and the identification of the accused has yet to be established from the victim's testimony. Therefore, counsel prays for the grant of concession of regular bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State Counsel, while producing the custody certificate along with the reply by way of affidavit of Tarlochan Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Samrala, opposes the prayer and submits that petitioner was driving the car at the time of the incident, with the accused, namely Jarmanjit Singh, seated beside him, who fired the shot with a pistol. Counsel further submits that petitioner is involved in a serious offence and, moreover, is implicated in another case under the provisions of the NDPS Act. Therefore, learned State Counsel prays for the dismissal of the present petition

5. Having heard learned counsel for the respective parties and upon perusal of the record available before this Court, it is observed that

**CRM-M-29985-2025****3**

petitioner is in custody for a substantial period of nine months and nine days. Despite charges having been framed, none of the prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. The allegations against the petitioner are yet to be substantiated, and considering that the trial is likely to take considerable time, the personal liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed indefinitely. Accordingly, this Court finds merit in the prayer of the petitioner.

6. 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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**25.07.2025***Rashmi*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*      *Yes/No*  
*Whether Reportable:*              *Yes/No*