



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

CRM-M-32413-2025

Reserved on: 7th August, 2025

Pronounced on: 12th August, 2025

Ravinder Singh @ Gagan

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Hitesh Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The instant one is the second petition for grant of regular bail as filed by the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 55 dated 25.09.2022 registered under Sections 364, 342 and 34 of IPC (Sections 302 and 201 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Bhadaur, District Barnala. His previous petition bearing CRM-M-42773-023 has been dismissed by this Court vide order dated 05.11.2024.

2. The petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences on the allegations that he had committed the murder of victim Harpreet Singh @ Kalu after abducting him and caused disappearance of dead body of the victim and evidence of offence of murder of the victim. The previous petition as filed by the petitioner had been dismissed by making the following observations:-



“The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have committed the murder of the victim after abducting him and is also alleged to made an attempt to cause disappearance of the dead body and evidence of offence of murder of the victim. The mobile phone belonging to the victim is alleged to have been given by him and co-accused Rajinder Singh @ Kala to one Smt. Shinder Kaur, whose statement has been recorded by the police. There is nothing on record to suggest that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the trial. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Keeping in view the nature of allegations, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits thereof, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.”

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. Circumstances have changed ever since the date of dismissal of the previous petition since now Shinder Kaur, who was the material witness has been given up by the prosecution. Two more material witnesses namely Labh Singh and Nachhattar Singh have not supported the prosecution version. There is no other circumstantial evidence to connect the petitioner with the subject crime. He is in custody since 30.09.2022. The extended period of incarceration is also an important ground for seeking release on bail to the petitioner. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report and custody certificates have been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that keeping in view the gravity of the



allegations as leveled against the petitioner and the fact that the previous petition as filed by the petitioner had been dismissed on merits, he doesn't deserve to be extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. There is no eyewitness to the murder of the victim. It is a case of circumstantial evidence. The prosecution case is that PWs Nachatar Singh and Labh Singh had overheard some conversation between the petitioner and the co-accused with regard to committing murder of the victim. Both these witnesses have been examined before the learned trial Court. Now copies of their statements have been placed on record as exhibit P-3 and P-4 respectively. A perusal of the same reveals that PW-3 Labh Singh has not supported the prosecution version and has turned hostile. However, PW-2 Nachatar Singh though declared hostile is shown to have supported the prosecution version about overhearing conversation between the petitioner and co-accused, about committing murder of the victim. As such, at this stage, it cannot be stated that he did not support the prosecution version. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. Trial is going on at a proper pace and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. As such, no substantive or specious change in the circumstances has come on record which may form basis for release of the petitioner on bail. A detailed order was passed while dismissing the first bail petition of the petitioner. There is no substantive or specious change in the circumstances from the date of dismissal of the



previous petition as filed by the petitioner. It is also well settled that there must be drastic change during the period between two applications for the successive application to be allowed, which is not there in this case. As such, I see no ground to allow the petition. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

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

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

12th August, 2025
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |