



CRM-M-46381-2025

-1-

**203a IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-46381-2025

Decided on: 14.11.2025

Ravinder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Randeep Singh Rai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Anurag Arora, Advocate,
Mr. Tarun Lehal, Advocate,
Mr. Arjun S. Rai, Advocate,
Mr. Rehan Gupta, Advocate and
Mr. Sukhsharan Sra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Jastej Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Bipan Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. A.S. Cheema, Advocate,
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate,
Mr. Prince Bharol, Advocate and
Mr. Akhil Godara, Advocate, for the complainant.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.62 dated 20.04.2025, registered under Sections 103, 62 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25, 27, 30, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

This Court vide order dated 04.08.2025 had granted interim protection to co-accused Nachattar Pal Singh, in **CRM-M-41192-2025** filed by him praying for grant of anticipatory bail, by directing the Investigating Agency not to take any coercive action against him. Present petitioner, namely, Ravinder Singh also filed similar present petition and thus, this Court passed the similar interim order qua him as well vide order dated 22.08.2025.



CRM-M-46381-2025

-2-

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Sazia Brar. It was alleged that she is doing M Phil from AMITY University. She has one younger brother, namely, Surya Pratap Singh. Both the siblings are unmarried and are living with their father Vinay Pratap Singh Brar. Their ancestral village is Abul Khurana, where they have their ancestral property. On 19.04.2025, her father Vinay Pratap Singh Brar and her brother Surya Pratap Singh had gone to their ancestral village Abul Khurana for harvesting the wheat crops. It was alleged that a dispute regarding 20 killas of land was already going on between her father and Davinder Singh @ Rana, Nachhatar Pal Singh and his son Ravinder Singh @ Babbi (petitioner). Though efforts were made several times for amicable settlement, but the same did not materialize. Davinder Singh @ Rana had threatened her father several times due to the ongoing civil dispute. On 19.04.2025 at about 06:00 p.m., when her father Vinay Pratap Singh Brar and her brother Surya Pratap Singh and their relative Darshan Singh Mofar were returning from taking a round of their land, they were waylaid by Davinder Singh @ Rana, who was on his tractor. There was one more person sitting on the mudguard of the tractor, who was holding a baseball bat in his hand. Her father Vinay Pratap Singh and his brother Surya Pratap Singh and their relative Darshan Singh Mofar came out of the vehicle. Davinder Singh @ Rana and the unknown person with him also came off and started abusing her father and brother. Darshan Singh Mofar tried to pacify both the parties, however, in the meantime, the unknown person gave blow of baseball bat on the face of her father, then her brother also took a



CRM-M-46381-2025

-3-

baseball bat from his car and on seeing him, Davinder Singh @ Rana took out his revolver from his *dub* and fired twice in front of Darshan Singh Mofar on her father, which hit in his waist. He again fired, which hit Surya Pratap Singh in his waist. On account of the bullet injuries, both of them collapsed and died on the spot. It was alleged that her relative Darshan Singh Mofar had witnessed the whole incident and he fled away from the place of occurrence. Davinder Singh @ Rana after committing murder of father and brother of the complainant, had absconded. Both the dead bodies were shifted to mortuary of Civil Hospital at Malout. Motive behind these murders was an ongoing enmity due to the land dispute between her father and Davinder Singh @ Rana, Nachhatar Pal Singh and Ravinder Singh @ Babbi (petitioner). It was alleged that all these persons in conspiracy with each other had killed the father and brother of the complainant. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded on 29.04.2025 and the allegations regarding threat given to the complainant by the petitioner and his father were also made. Apprehending arrest, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for the grant of anticipatory bail. However, learned Court after hearing both the sides, finding no merit in the petition filed by the petitioner, dismissed the same vide order dated 08.08.2025. Hence, aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the occurrence in the present case had taken place on



CRM-M-46381-2025

-4-

19.04.2025 between 06:00 p.m. to 07:00 p.m. and telephonic information was given to SHO concerned at about 07:30 p.m. He has submitted that the police visited the place of occurrence and had collected the blood samples and other articles from the scene of occurrence. It is submitted that though it has been alleged that Darshan Singh Mofar was the eye witness, however, he is a planted eye witness as he was never present at the time of occurrence. Learned Senior Counsel had given a pen drive of video, which was recovered from the phone of the deceased. It is submitted that from the bare perusal of the allegations made in the FIR, the only allegation made against the petitioner is that there was a civil dispute going on between the deceased and the petitioner regarding agricultural land. It is submitted that statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. of the alleged eye witness Darshan Singh Mofar had been recorded on 21.04.2025 and the only allegation made against the petitioner, is the motive. He has submitted that the complainant was never the witness of the occurrence and she had levelled allegations in the FIR on the basis of the statement made by the alleged eye witness and thus, the allegations made in the FIR, are nothing but a hearsay evidence since the alleged eye witness was himself not present at the time of occurrence and in a due deliberated manner, he was planted as an eye witness of the occurrence. He submits that supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded on 29.04.2025 i.e. 10 days after the occurrence, wherein, it is for the first time, the allegations were levelled against the petitioner regarding threat having been given by him to the complainant. It is submitted that the allegations made in the supplementary statement at this stage are nothing but an afterthought and the same cannot be relied upon.



CRM-M-46381-2025

-5-

He submits that neither the petitioner was present at the time of occurrence nor he had played any overt act. He submits that the Investigating Agency had fabricated the evidence regarding the weapon of offence used in the commission of offence. He has submitted that Nachattar Pal Singh i.e. father of petitioner Ravinder Singh had sold the weapon more than two years ago and thus, implication of the petitioner on the basis of false and frivolous evidence having been produced, is writ large. He further submits that from the analysis of video, which was recovered from the phone of the deceased (father of the complainant) itself, it is evident that the deceased were the aggressors and had gone to village Abul Khurana with a clear motive of killing the petitioner side. He, thus, submits that keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, no *prima facie* case is made out against the petitioner and hence, he deserves to be granted anticipatory bail.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that admittedly a civil dispute regarding 20 killas of land was already going on between both the sides. He submits that the petitioner has been specifically alleged in the FIR by the complainant having the motive to be the part of the conspiracy in eliminating both the father and brother of the complainant. He submits that whole occurrence was witnessed by Darshan Singh Mofar, who escaped from the place of occurrence after witnessing the murder of father and brother of the complainant. It is submitted that the FIR was lodged by the complainant in the presence of Darshan Singh Mofar i.e. the eye witness. He submits that during the investigation, the Investigating Agency verified the call detail records of the



CRM-M-46381-2025

-6-

petitioner. He submits that the video recovered from the phone of the deceased was of the time 06:07 p.m. and the main accused Davinder Singh @ Rana called the petitioner at 06:10:33, 06:11:06, 06:11:19 and 06:22:11 (all p.m.). He submits that these conversions between the petitioner and Davinder Singh @ Rana at the relevant time when the murders had taken place, clearly speak of conspiracy between both of them. He submits that call details of co-accused Nachhatar Pal have also been collected by the Investigating Agency. He, thus, submits that the occurrence was duly witnessed by the eye witness Darshan Singh Mofar and on his narration, the FIR was lodged by the complainant. He submits that the complainant in her supplementary statement had specifically alleged that the petitioner had threatened the complainant a day prior to the occurrence. He submits that there is strong motive with the petitioner for commission of offence, which is strengthened from the call detail records. He, thus, submits that keeping in view the gravity of the offence committed by the petitioner, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Learned State counsel has also vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the status report filed. He submits that the case of the prosecution is based on the eye witness account. Darshan Singh Mofar was alongwith the complainant while lodging the FIR. The complainant had specifically alleged a strong motive against the petitioner and co-accused. It is evident that civil litigation was going on between both the sides. He submits that from the video played in the Court, it is evident that Davinder Singh @ Rana on seeing the deceased making his video, had



CRM-M-46381-2025

-7-

tried to flee from there, however, thereafter, he was not only instigated by the petitioner, but was provided with weapon of offence as well for committing murders of both father and son. He submits that complicity of the petitioner is evident from the call detail records and the weapon of offence recovered. He submits that rifle was also recovered from the Dhani of Nachhatar Singh i.e. the father of the petitioner. It is, thus, submitted that keeping in view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out against the petitioner.

6. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance. It is deciphered that both the sides were already involved in civil litigation, which is admittedly pending before Civil Court. The occurrence in the present case has taken place on 19.04.2025 between 06:00 p.m. to 07:00 p.m. Evidently, at the time of occurrence, co-accused Davinder Singh @ Rana was alongwith one more person on his tractor. The video recovered from the phone of the deceased was produced and the same was played in the Court. The alleged video was collected by the Investigating Agency from the phone of the deceased. As submitted before this Court, the video pertains to the relevant time i.e. just prior to the occurrence when Vinay Pratap Singh Brar and Surya Pratap Singh were shot dead by the co-accused, namely, Davinder Singh @ Rana. As per the allegations made in the FIR, the petitioner is the conspirator with co-accused Davinder Singh @ Rana and others. The allegations regarding threats having been extended to the complainant a day prior to the incident as surfaced in the supplementary statement recorded 10 days thereafter, i.e. on 29.04.2025. The Investigating Agency verified the call details of the



petitioner with co-accused Davinder Singh @ Rana and the same were found to be of the relevant time, which read as under:-

99158-60566 (Davinder Singh) and 98144-00080 (Babbi Singh)					
99158-60566	98144-00080	19-Apr-25	18:10:33	3	Call out
	98144-00080	19-Apr-25	18:11:06	4	Call out
	98144-00080	19-Apr-25	18:11:19	48	Call in
	98144-00080	19-Apr-25	18:22:11	90-67	Call out

Though verification of the call details of co-accused Nachhatar Singh are not of the same time, but that of the petitioner is of the relevant time. For the allegations of conspiracy, there cannot be a direct evidence and the same is to be gathered from the attending circumstances. The investigation is at the initial stage.

7. For the consideration of anticipatory bail, the statutory parameters are given under Section 482 (1) & (2) of BNSS which reads as under:-

482“Direction for grant of bail to person apprehending arrest:

1. When any person has reason to believe that he may be arrested on an accusation of having committed a non-bailable offence, he may apply to the High Court or the Court of Session for a direction under this section; and that Court may, if it thinks fit, direct that in the event of such arrest, he shall be released on bail.
2. When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly,



CRM-M-46381-2025

-9-

make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section."

8. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State represented by CBI Vs. Anil Sharma**, (1997) 7 SCC 187 has held as under:-

"6. We find force in the submission of the CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation oriented than questioning a suspect who is well ensconced with a favorable order under [Section 438](#) if the code. In a case like this effective interrogation of suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disintering many useful informations and also materials which would have been concealed. Succession such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail during the time he interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The court has to presume that responsible Police Officers would conduct themselves in task of disintering offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

9. Hon'ble Apex Court in plethora of judicial precedents including **Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs. State of Punjab**, AIR 1980 SC 1632, has time and again reiterated that while considering the anticipatory bail the Court is to take into consideration the factors like gravity of



CRM-M-46381-2025

-10-

offence, chances of accused tampering with the evidence and probabilities of his fleeing from justice etc. The Court should be circumspect about the impact of its decision on the society as well. The anticipatory bail is an extraordinary discretion which should be exercised in the extraordinary circumstances.

10. Weighing the facts of the case on the anvil of the law settled, it is apparent that the complicity of the petitioner has been *prima facie* established. The investigation is at its threshold. Thus, granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would scuttle the ongoing investigation.

11. In view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner does not qualify for exercising the extraordinary power by this Court in his favour. Resultantly, the petition being devoid of any merit is hereby dismissed.

12. As evident from the record, the petitioner had been granted interim protection by this Court vide order dated 22.08.2025. Hence, in case, the petitioner surrenders before the authorities or the Court concerned and file an application for the grant of bail, the Court concerned would consider the same expeditiously, preferably within a period of two weeks from its filing, as in accordance with law.

13. Nothing said herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

14.11.2025
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned
Whether Reportable

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

: Yes/No
: Yes/No