



S. No.228

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

CRM-M-40183 of 2025

Date of Decision:28.10.2025

Ranjodh Singh**.....Petitioner****Vs.****State of Punjab****.....Respondent****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present:- Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ish Puneet Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

Yashvir Singh Rathor, J. (Oral)

1. This is second petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.281 dated 14.12.2022 registered under Sections 307, 323, 325, 148, 149, 34, 120-B IPC, 1860 and Section 25/27/54/59 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar.

2. Upon notice, learned State Counsel and counsel for the complainant have appeared. Learned counsel for the parties have been heard and the material placed on record has been perused.

3. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Gurbinder Singh with the allegations that on 13.12.2022, at about 08:00 AM, he was coming from Gurudwara on his Aactiva and when he reached near Elementary School, Issapur, three persons came from the opposite side, on motor-



cycle out of whom Ranjodh Singh – petitioner, was armed with a revolver whereas two unknown persons accompanying him, were armed with baseball bat and datar. Another person, who had covered his face was also doing the surveillance (raiki) on a motor-cycle. In the meantime, Manjit Singh who was hiding behind the school wall also came and raised a lalkara. Unknown persons, who were armed with baseball bat and datar attacked him and caused blows with baseball bat and datar on his waist and head. Thereafter, Ranjodh Singh fired a shot in the air and then fired another shot towards him with an intention to kill him which hit in his right thigh as a result of which, he fell on the ground. In the meantime, his wife reached at the spot and all the accused ran away from the spot. He alleged that one Manjit Kaur was behind this occurrence as she used to give threats to kill him. Petitioner was arrested on 23.05.2023 and after completion of investigation, final report was presented.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the first bail application moved by the petitioner was withdrawn vide order dated 01.10.2024 and during pendency of the previous bail application, directions were given to get the victim examined as apparent in the order dated 16.09.2024 passed by the trial Court. However, till date, complainant has not intentionally appeared to depose and is prolonging the matter for one reason or the other. Learned counsel further contended that the petitioner is in custody since 23.05.2023 and the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude and even otherwise, the victim has suffered bullet injury in his thigh, which is a non vital part. Learned counsel further contended that prolonged incarceration and undue delay in disposal of the trial are violative of the fundamental right of personal liberty of petitioner under Article 21 of the



Constitution of India and learned counsel prayed that petitioner be released on bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State Counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner is a hardened criminal and in case, he is released on bail, he will try to intimidate the victim or win him over and in view of gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve concession of bail.

6. Petitioner is in custody since 23.05.2023. The final report has already been presented. The trial Court in its order dated 16.09.2024 has observed that the High Court has directed injured to be examined vide order dated 06.08.2024 and injured and his wife are present but they have moved an application for exempting their presence. Thereafter, victim was partly examined and an application under Section 319 Cr.P.C was moved and later on, it was withdrawn and various orders placed on record today by the petitioner show that victim has not been examined till date. Even otherwise, victim Gurbinder Singh has suffered bullet injury in his thigh which is a non vital part. It well settled that bail is the rule and jail is an exception and bail should not be denied as a punitive measure or a form of punishment before conviction and no useful purpose will, thus, be served by detaining the petitioner in custody anymore.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/ Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.



8. Pending misc. application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(Yashvir Singh Rathor)
Judge

October 28, 2025
renu

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No