



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

221

CRM-M-44162-2025

Date of decision: 12th November, 2025

Ranjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 123 dated 22.06.2023 registered under Sections 302, 379, 392, 411 read with Section 34 of IPC (offence under Section 392 and 411 of IPC added later on) at Police Station City 1, Abohar, District Fazilka.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Dalbir Singh alleging that on 21.06.2023, he along with his father Kartar Singh had gone to his agricultural land for getting the same cultivated. In the evening, he came back home whereas his father had stayed there. In the next morning, at about 5:40 AM, when he reached in his agricultural land, he found their tractor trolley to be missing. Even his father's cot was not there. He opened the



door of the motor room and found his father to be lying dead on the cot. His limbs were tied with ropes, cloth was stuffed in his mouth and a cloth was wrapped around his neck. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Post mortem examination of dead body and inquest proceedings were conducted. The complainant recorded his supplementary statement on 23.06.2023 on the basis of which, the petitioner and co-accused Akashdeep, Gurjant Singh and Harmanjit Singh, were nominated as additional accused. During the course of investigation, CCTV footage from the toll plaza, village Kot Kror Kala, Talwandi Bai, during the period from 22.06.2023 to 23.06.2023, was collected, and it was revealed that at about 7:30 a.m., accused Gurjant Singh, Akashdeep, and Harmandeep Singh had crossed lane No. 9 of the toll plaza with the stolen tractor-trolley. As per the post-mortem report, death had occurred due to respiratory failure as a result of asphyxia. The petitioner was arrested on 24.06.2023. The co-accused were also arrested. They suffered disclosure statements admitting their involvement in the crime by disclosing that in connivance with each other, they had robbed the tractor trolley of the complainant and had killed his father while he was sleeping. In pursuance of his disclosure statement, the petitioner got recovered the registration certificate of the tractor trolley of the complainant from his house and co-accused Gurjant Singh @ Janta got recovered the stolen tractor trolley. Offences under Sections 392 and 411 of the IPC were added. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of a supplementary statement recorded by the complainant one day after the incident and on the



disclosure statements allegedly suffered by the co-accused, which cannot be considered admissible in evidence. There is no eyewitness to the murder of the victim. The case is based on circumstantial evidence, and no circumstance has been collected to connect the petitioner with the crime. He has been in custody for a period of more than two years and four months. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. He has clean antecedents. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who, in connivance with the co-accused, had gone to the land of the complainant, committed the robbery of the tractor-trolley belonging to the complainant/his father, and killed him while he was sleeping. The registration certificate of the stolen tractor was recovered at the instance of the petitioner. The trial has commenced, and a good number of witnesses has already been examined. There is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in the conclusion of the trial. 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.

6. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused, is alleged to have committed the theft of/robbery of the tractor-trolley belonging to the complainant/his father, and caused the homicidal death of the victim by inflicting injuries and strangulating him. The recovery of the registration



certificate of the robbed vehicle has been effected from him. He might not have been seen in the CCTV footage; however, there are other circumstances connecting him with the crime. The trial is proceeding at a proper pace. Material witnesses are yet to be examined. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, as he, along with the co-accused stands accused of a heinous crime punishable with capital punishment or life imprisonment. While length of incarceration is a factor that weighs with the Court in considering bail, however, it cannot overshadow the gravity of the accusation of murder under Section 302 IPC. It is well settled proposition of law that prolonged incarceration in heinous crimes like murder cannot be considered to be a ground for release of accused on bail. While granting bail, the factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the witnesses are also to be weighed. Frivolity of prosecution should always be considered, and it is only the element of genuineness that has to be considered in the matter of grant of bail.

7. In light of the foregoing legal principles, having regard to the applicant's role in the incident, the reasonable apprehension of his absconding or tampering with evidence, this Court is of the considered opinion that the release of the petitioner may imperil the course of trial and undermine the integrity thereof. As such, this Court finds no compelling ground to grant bail to the petitioner. Resultantly, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is clarified that any observation made in this order is only for



deciding this petition and shall not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on merits.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

12th November, 2025
Parveen Sharma

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