



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

202

CRM-M-50466-2024

Date of decision: 18.01.2025

RAMANDEEP SINGH@RAMAN

....Petitioner

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. A.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate with
Mr. Ashish Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Navdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 in case FIR No.132 dated 13.11.2023 under Sections 302, 307, 160, 323, 324, 148, 149 of the IPC and Sections 27, 25, 59 of the Arms Act (Sections 212, 216, 120-B and 473 of the IPC added later on) registered at Police Station D Division, District Amritsar.

2. On the last date of hearing, the following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is matter of record that the petitioner sustained fire arm injuries on his person in the occurrence in question; when the police came to the spot, the petitioner along with the deceased and one other injured was found lying on the road side in an injured condition. Even as per the case of prosecution, no weapon much less weapon of offence was found on his



person at the relevant time. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that in the circumstances, without there being any specific attribution to the petitioner, his further incarceration would serve no useful purpose, more so, when challan already stands presented against him. Learned counsel for the State, on instructions, has not disputed that the challan stands presented against the petitioner, it has also not been disputed that the petitioner sustained fire arm injury in the occurrence in question.

However, on a pointed query put to the learned State counsel as to whether any evidence had been collected after the registration of the FIR in question with respect to the specific role played by the petitioner in the occurrence in question, since it is a case of version and cross-version, learned State counsel has feigned incomplete instructions and instead prayed for a short adjournment to file an affidavit detailing the material collected by the Investigating Agency with respect to the role and participation of the petitioner in the occurrence in question.

On request, adjourned to 12.12.2024.”

3. Learned counsel for the State in compliance of the aforesaid order has, on instructions from ACP Jaspal Singh, PPS, submitted that the petitioner was named in the FIR in question and as per the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused, he was armed with a .30 bore pistol which he gave to co-accused Shamsher Singh who, in turn, handed over to accused Shyam Singh and further to accused Sukhdev Singh from whom it was eventually recovered.



On a further query posed to the learned State counsel, it has not been disputed that the investigation in the present case is complete and challan stands presented, coupled with the fact that the petitioner has been in custody since 29.12.2023 and the possibility of the trial concluding in the near future seems unlikely.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material placed on record.

5. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner be admitted to bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. Needless to add, in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail granted to him, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of the same.

January 18, 2025
poonam

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No