



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

CRM-M-35210-2025

Reserved on: 22nd August, 2025

Pronounced on: 29th August, 2025

Ranjit Singh @ Laddi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Parvinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The instant one is the second petition filed by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 36 dated 17.04.2022 registered under Section 302 of IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act (Section 120-B of IPC added later on) at Police Station Sadar Banga, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a statement recorded by the complainant Sarabjit Singh on 17.04.2022 alleging that on the morning of 16.04.2022, his father Sukhwinder Singh had parked his vehicle in the cattle feed shed and left for his house. After some time, he received information that his father had sustained some injury. The complainant, who was present in his shop, rushed home and found his father in an injured condition. He took his father to the hospital but was declared to be brought dead. Post mortem examination of the dead body was conducted.



The complainant had made inquiries and, on checking CCTV cameras installed in the house of neighbourer Kulwinder, he found a *Sikh* person while going towards his house at 7:30 AM and running back hurriedly at 7:45 AM. He was also seen to be carrying a weapon. By alleging that his father had been shot at by the said unknown person, he prayed for taking action. Investigation proceedings were initiated. On 03.07.2022, witness Kulwinder Singh recorded his statement to the effect that the present petitioner had made an extra-judicial confession before him admitting his involvement in the murder of the victim. Thereafter, he was nominated as an accused and was arrested on 05.07.2022. On interrogation, he suffered a disclosure statement admitting that he had shot at the victim due to having previous enmity with him. The weapons used in commission of offence along with other incriminating material was also got recovered from him. Investigation has since been completed and the petitioner, along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of the aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of statement recorded by PW- Kulwinder singh which cannot be considered to be admissible. False recovery has been planted upon the petitioner and he has been in custody since long. The petitioner is not clearly reflected in the CCTV footage. The trial will take considerable time to conclude since out of 27 prosecution witnesses only 04 PWs have been examined so far. His involvement in other cases cannot be considered to be a reason for denying benefit of bail to him. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.



4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned State counsel that he is a man of criminal nature and is a habitual offender since many cases have been registered against him. The petitioner suffered extra judicial confession before PW- Kulwinder Singh. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. The allegations against him are serious in nature. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have fired shots with pistol upon the father of the complainant, and as a result, he died on 16.04.2022. The petitioner was seen going towards the house of the victim in the CCTV camera footage. Recovery of weapon of offence has also been effected from him. He is also alleged to have suffered extra judicial confession before PW- Kulwinder Singh, who is yet to be examined. There are serious allegations against the petitioner. The well settled proposition of law is that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made in ***Parmod Kumar Saxena Vs. UOI, 2008(63) ACC (SC), Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC, 242*** and ***State through CBI Vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)***. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the quantum of sentence for which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case



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.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

29th August, 2025
Parveen Sharma

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