



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
253

CRM-M-48677-2025
Decided on : 10.11.2025

RAVI SINGH AND ANR. Petitioner(s)
Versus
STATE OF PUNJAB Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, PUnjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
1. Ravi Singh, aged 32 years. 2. Karanbir Singh @ Karandeep Singh, aged 21 years	215	16.09.2024	109, 351(3), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 and S. 25, 27 of Arms Act	Gharinda	Amritsar

2. As per the FIR registered at the instance of complainant Pritam Singh, aged 55 years, on 15.09.2024, at about 8:00 P.M., when he was present in his house along with his wife Baljeet Kaur and sons Arshbir Singh and Major Singh, persons Inderbir Singh @ Amb and Gora came to the door of his house and started calling for his third son, Karanbir Singh. On being informed that he was not at home, the complainant was asked to reach a nearby chowk along with his wife and two sons. When they reached the



spot, they found i) Sunny, ii) Ravi (petitioner No.1), and iii) Karanbir Singh (petitioner No.2) s/o Gurvil present there, who started arguing with the complainant party. During this, accused Inderbir Singh @ Amb took out a pistol and fired two shots—one of which missed, while the second hit Baljeet Kaur on her right thigh. On hearing the sound of firing, several people gathered at the spot, and the accused fled away.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that even if the incident, as alleged, is taken to be true, the firearm injury suffered by the injured Baljeet Kaur is on a non-vital part of the body. Had there been any intention to cause her death, the co-accused Inderbir Singh @ Amb would have aimed or repeated the shot on a vital part of the body. Thus, it would remain a moot question during the trial whether the act was intended to terrorize the complainant party or to commit murder.

4. It is further argued that petitioners – Ravi Singh and Karanbir Singh @ Karandeep Singh – have not been attributed any specific role in the alleged occurrence. There is no allegation that they were armed with any weapon or that they extended threats to the complainant party. Therefore, even if their presence at the spot is presumed, there is no active participation attributed to them. Both petitioners have been in custody since 25.06.2025, and keeping them incarcerated any further would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, they pray for the grant of regular bail.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the status report dated 09.11.2025 in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at the appropriate place. A copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners.



6. Referring to paragraph No.14 of the status report, learned State counsel submits that both the petitioners, while accompanying the main accused, had allegedly hurled abuses and extended threats to the complainant party. However, he fairly concedes that there is no allegation of either of the petitioners being armed with any weapon or having inflicted any injury. The other factual aspects, as noticed above, are not disputed.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

8. Having considered the rival submissions and the material available on record, it is noticed that the specific act of firing is attributed only to the co-accused Inderbir Singh @ Amb. Both the present petitioners have been in custody since 25.06.2025, and the challan has already been presented. The conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. Their alleged role being limited to mere presence at the spot, their complicity shall be a matter for adjudication during the course of trial.

In view of the totality of circumstances and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to extend the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or



indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 10, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No