



CRA-S-2344-2025

201 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRA-S-2344-2025
Date of Decision: 02.09.2025

Ranjit Singh and others ...Appellants

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Venu Gopal Jauhar, Advocate
for the appellants.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. P.S. Sekhon, Advocate and
Mr. Mikhail Kad, Advocate
for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
129	31.05.2025	Bhawanigarh	115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 190 BNS and 3(1)(r), 3(2) (va) SC&ST Act

1. Aggrieved by the dismissal of their bail under section 482 BNSS, 2023, the accused-appellants have come up before this court by filing an appeal under section 14-A of Scheduled Caste & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, (SCSTPOA), seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Per paragraph 17 of the appeal, the appellants have no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the translated version of FIR, which reads as follows:

“Statement of Bikramjit Singh alias Vicky, son of Bharpoor Singh, resident of Village Bhrow, Police Station Bhawanigarh, age approximately 45 years, Mobile No. 98555-xxxxx: I am a resident of the aforementioned address and the former Sarpanch of the village. My mother, Parkash Kaur, is the current Sarpanch of Village Bhrow, Block Bhawanigarh. On 27-05-2025, at approximately 9:30 AM, I was with my nephew Vijay Pratap Singh, son of Sukhwinder Singh, resident of Bhadaso, who stays with me. He is studying in Class II at Government Primary School, Bhrow. After attending the Parents Meeting at the school, I was coming out of the school gate. As I was



CRA-S-2344-2025

exiting, an Innova vehicle approached the school gate, which was being driven by Gurvinder Singh alias Gindi, a resident of my village. From the Innova vehicle, Ranjit Singh, son of Bharpoor Singh, resident of Bhrow, got down with an iron rod in his hand. He got out of the Innova vehicle and shouted: "You Chooda, we will not leave you alive." Then Rikka Singh, son of Gurmeet Singh, and Babbi Singh, son of Ranjit Singh, residents of Bhrow, said: -Chooda, if we leave you alive today, don't call us sons of Jatts!" Then Ranjit Singh, son of Bharpoor Singh, with an iron rod, and Rikka Singh, son of Gurmeet Singh, with a wooden baseball bat, launched an attack on me. As a result, I fell to the ground. Then Ranjit Singh (iron rod), Babbi Singh (iron rod), Randhir Singh, son of Bharpoor Singh (bamboo stick), Gurvinder Singh alias Gindi, son of Sukhjinder Singh alias Lattu (wooden stick)-with the intent to kill me, all of them brutally beat me while I lay on the ground. They tied a scarf (parna) around my neck and smashed me to the ground, and tried to strangle me to death. At that time, a few people who had come to collect medicine at the dispensary ran away after seeing the fight. When I cried out for help, there was a loud commotion in the school. Upon hearing my cries, Mid-Day Meal worker Manpreet Kaur, wife of Bittu Singh, and 3-4 women came forward and rescued me. The reason for the enmity is that earlier, during my term as Sarpanch, I had served the village well. Subsequently, due to the reservation for women and SCs, my mother Parkash Kaur was again elected Sarpanch. From that day, this family held a grudge against me and my family. Another reason is that two days earlier, Ranjit Singh, son of Bharpoor Singh, had clicked photos of MNREGA women workers, to which the MNREGA women objected. I tried to explain and intervene, but the accused began harboring resentment, and this is why they attacked me. Then the said individuals threatened to kill me, and fled the spot in the same vehicle, carrying their respective weapons. Later, my mother Parkash Kaur, with the help of other villagers, arranged for transport and got me admitted to PHC Bhawanigarh for treatment. The doctor there referred me to Civil Hospital Sangrur for better treatment. After medical tests, I was discharged. But I now fear for my life from these individuals. They can cause me bodily or financial harm. I am living in fear. I have written and presented this statement in full possession of my senses. I request that appropriate legal action be taken against the said individuals. Sd/- Complainant Bikramjit Singh."

4. The appellants' counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the appellants and their family.

5. The appellants' counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the appellants repeat the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the appellants shall have no objection.



CRA-S-2344-2025

6. The State’s counsel opposes bail based on instructions.
7. Counsel for the appellants submits that in compliance of order dated 11.08.2025, they have voluntarily handed over two affidavits. He further submits that the matter stands compromised between the parties.
8. Counsel for the complainant does not dispute the aforesaid fact.
9. Since the parties settled their dispute and given the nature of injury, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the appellants. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.
10. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the appellants makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.
11. Given above, provided the appellants-accused are not required in any other case, the appellants shall be released on anticipatory bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.
12. While furnishing a personal bond, the appellants-accused shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

13. This order is subject to the appellants’ complying with the following terms.
14. The appellants are directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The appellants shall be in deemed custody



CRA-S-2344-2025

for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The appellants shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the appellants shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

15. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

16. This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner repeats the offense, the State may file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall be at liberty to cancel this bail.

17. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

18. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the appellants can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

19. **Appeal allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

02.09.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.