



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
at Chandigarh**

230

CRM-M-61766-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 02.12.2025

Ranjit Singh @ Rana ... Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present:- Mr. Arshpreet Khadial, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab,
assisted with ASI Jaspal Singh,

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in case FIR No.0095 dated 20.05.2024 registered under Sections 302, 34, 120-B, 201 of IPC, at Police Station Bhikhi, District Mansa.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the present petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The petitioner is in custody since 21.05.2024 and is not involved in any other case. The material witnesses have already been examined in this case, however, they have not supported the case of the prosecution. It is further contended that the petitioner is 65% disabled person and he is suffering from health ailment, which needs immediate surgery. Learned counsel also placed on record the statement of PW-6 i.e. Chamkaur Singh, who is the witness of extra judicial confession by the co-accused Mandeep Kaur.



CRM-M-61766-2025 (O&M)

(2)

3. Learned State counsel has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner, which shows that the petitioner is behind bars for the last about 1 year, 6 months and 7 days and is not involved in any other case except the present one. Custody certificate is taken on record. Learned State counsel submits that there are serious allegations against the present petitioner that he along with his co-accused, who is wife of Buta Singh (deceased) has murdered her husband by administering some poisonous substance and threw the dead body in the canal, but it is not disputed that the material witnesses have already been examined and have not supported the case of prosecution. Out of 22 PWs, only 6 PWs have been examined, 1 PW has given up and the official witnesses are yet to be examined.

4. Heard.

5. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case; particularly in view of the fact that the main allegation is against co-accused Manpreet Kaur, who happens to be wife of the deceased and murdered her husband by administering some poisonous substance; the petitioner is in custody for the last about 1 year, 6 months and 7 days; material witnesses have been examined by the prosecution, but they have not supported its case, only official witnesses are yet to be examined; he is not involved in any other case except the present one; there is no other material on the file to suggest that after release, the petitioner will tamper with the prosecution evidence; and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as a measure of punishment as culpability is to be decided by trial Court after appreciating evidence adduced by the parties, and it is a trite principle of criminal

CRM-M-61766-2025 (O&M)

(3)

jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned, subject to the condition that his presence can be secured during trial.

7. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case. The learned Court below is directed to proceed with the matter on its own merits, lest it may prejudice the trial.

02.12.2025

Geeta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No