



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

234

CRM-M-58137-2025

Date of decision: 12th November, 2025

Vikramjit Singh @ Vikram Singh @
Vicky @ Bikram Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ketan Chopra, 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. 60 dated 11.06.2023 registered under Sections 302, 201, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Payal, District Ludhiana.

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant–Fateh Singh @ Fatta alleging that he was got admitted into a Drug De-Addiction Centre, in village Payal, since he was a drug addict. The victim Amandeep Singh was also admitted by his family in the same centre which was operated by accused Parneet Singh. The activities of this centre were supervised by the petitioner, co-accused, Harmanpreet



Singh, Vikram Singh and Gurwinder Singh, who were also admitted in this centre. He alleged that on 21.04.2023, the victim Amandeep Singh was given the task of washing clothes and as he was little slow in doing the work, Parneet Singh along with the petitioner and other accused had started beating him. On the same night, when all of them were sitting in the hall, co-accused Pardeep Singh, who was empty handed and petitioner, co-accused Parneet Singh and Harmanpreet Singh who were carrying *dandas* along with accused Gurwinder Singh, had assaulted the victim by extending severe beatings to him resulting into his death. Thereafter, they had taken the body of the victim out of the hall and had locked the complainant and others inside. The complainant further alleged that though Parneet Singh had claimed subsequently that he had sent the victim back to his home, but on 09.06.2023, he came to know that the victim had been murdered as he had not been sent home. As such, he prayed for taking action.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Petitioner along with co-accused Parneet Singh and Harmanpreet Singh were arrested on the same day. They suffered disclosure statements as per which the co-accused Pardeep Singh had caught hold of the arms of the victim, whereas accused Gurwinder Singh had caught hold of his legs and the remaining accused had extended beatings to the victim by using sticks, due to which he had died. Similar disclosure statement was made by accused Parneet Singh. The investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of the aforementioned offences.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has



been falsely implicated in this case. The material prosecution witnesses, namely PW-1 Sarabjit Singh, PW-2 Harpreet Singh, PW-4 Fateh Singh(complainant), and PW-6 Jatinder Singh, have not supported the prosecution version. There is no incriminating evidence to connect the petitioner with the subject crime. No new or distinct fact is shown to have been discovered in pursuance of the disclosure statement allegedly suffered by him. He is in custody since 19.06.2023. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. The co-accused Pradeep, whose case is on a similar footing, has since been extended the benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, he does not deserve to be extended the benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and, in prosecution of the common object thereof, he is alleged to have extended beatings to the victim with sticks which resulted in his death. The complainant, who was the only witness to the occurrence, has been examined before the learned trial Court as PW-4 and has not supported the prosecution version. Other material witnesses, PW-1, PW-2, and PW-6, have also not supported the prosecution version. Keeping in view the nature of the evidence which has come on



record and does not implicate the petitioner in commission of the subject offence, coupled with the fact that there is no other eye witness to the occurrence, the period spent by the petitioner in custody and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner deserves to be released on bail at this stage. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to bail subject to his furnishing personal as well as surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/CJM/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. It is, however, made clear that nothing observed hereinabove, shall be construed to mean an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

12th November, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*
2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*
: *Yes / No*