



CRM-M-44492-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-44492-2025

Date of Decision: 21.08.2025

Ramandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Ms. Simran Gorla, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.59 dated 01.05.2024 under Section 302 IPC, registered at Police Station Ghuaman, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Amritpal Singh @ Amrit. It was alleged that his father used to serve at Gurudwara Dhodha Sahib near Tarn Taran and Baba Balwinder Singh (deceased) was serving at Gurudwara Sahib located in village Rasoolpur Nahira near Patti road, Tarn Taran. Due to their respective services at nearby Gurudwaras, Baba Balwinder Singh had a close association with his father. Since his childhood, he received Gurbani education from Baba Balwinder Singh. The complainant served with Baba Balwinder Singh at Gurudwara in village Jalalabad for two years. Thereafter, the complainant stayed with him for about 8-9 years at Gurudwara Sahib Sri Guru Amardas Ji near the Canal in Athwal. Baba Balwinder Singh got him married to Harneet Kaur. When he arrived at Gurudwara Sahib Athwal after his marriage, Ramandeep Singh (petitioner) was already present there with Baba Balwinder Singh. However, Baba



Balwinder Singh was not satisfied with the services of Ramandeep Singh and hence, services were generally assigned to the complainant. Due to this, Ramandeep Singh nurtured grudge against Baba Balwinder Singh. On 30.04.2024 at about 10:00 p.m., when he was sleeping in his room, he heard screams of Baba Balwinder Singh. On hearing the same, he rushed there and found that Ramandeep Singh was attacking Baba Balwinder Singh with knife. On raising alarm, Ramandeep Singh fled away towards the Canal with knife in his hand. The complainant found Baba Balwinder Singh lying on the floor, who had already died. He called the people of the village and his family members. Request was made to take legal action against Ramandeep Singh, who murdered Baba Balwinder Singh. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 13.05.2024. On the presentation of challan, charges were framed and trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 07.07.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner was hardly 19 years of age at the time of alleged occurrence. He submits that the petitioner has no motive whatsoever to commit the alleged offence, however, the complainant himself was living with the deceased since his childhood and it is because of rivalry between



Baba Balwinder Singh and other stake holders, who wanted to takeover the management of the Gurudwara. It is submitted that it is an admitted fact that deceased Baba Balwinder Singh was unmarried. The complainant, to take *de facto* control of Gurudwara, hatched the conspiracy by implicating the innocent petitioner in murdering Baba Balwinder Singh. He went on to argue that the complainant had been examined by the trial Court as PW-1 and confronted by the defence on all the probable issues. He submits that Gurudwara is equipped with CCTV cameras all around, but the same had been withheld by the Investigating Agency. It is submitted that during the cross examination, the complainant had deposed that control of the CCTV cameras was with him, however, this evidence has been withheld by the prosecution. He submits that Baba Balwinder Singh has been eliminated by the complainant in a clandestine manner in conspiracy with other stake holders, who had an evil eye to take control of the management of the Gurudwara. It is submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest. The complainant has already been examined and he has no criminal antecedents whatsoever. He, thus, submits that the petitioner, who is at threshold of his life, deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. She has submitted that case of the prosecution is based on the eye witness account, where the complainant has seen the occurrence. She has submitted that the deceased suffered 16 injuries and the complainant has been examined as PW-1 who has duly supported the case of the prosecution. She submits that weapon of offence has also been received from the petitioner. She has placed on record



CRM-M-44492-2025

-4-

the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the occurrence in this case had taken place in Gurudwara Sahib itself. The petitioner was present in Gurudwara. Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that CCTV footage had been withheld by the prosecution. The complainant already stands examined. The custody certificate of the petitioner would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 03 months & 03 days as on 20.08.2025. It further reveals that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents whatsoever.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

21.08.2025

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No