



CRM-M-67966-2025 (O&M) -1-

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

105

**CRM-M-67966-2025
Decided on: 03.12.2025**

RAMANDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Shreenath A. Khemka, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.152 dated 08.09.2025, under Sections 333 of BNS, 2023 & under Sections 25, 27 of Arms Act (Sections 190, 191(3), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 added later on, on 10.09.2025) registered at Police Station Cantt., Bathinda.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the complainant namely, Jashandeep Singh Brar who is studying in a College at Bathinda, used to reside with his grandparents to take care of them as they are old aged & remained ill. Their family has old property dispute with Harmander Singh, who is his paternal uncle (*Taya*) and has a political



influence. On 07.09.2025, at about 02:55 PM, when he was sitting alone in his aforesaid house, Harmander Singh along with Rammi Machhana and Gaggu Doomwali @ Sarpanch along with 10-12 other persons armed with weapons (automatic rifles & pistols) entered into his house on which Harmander Singh asked Rammi Machhana and his accomplices armed with weapons that they have to teach lesson to him and his family. Thereafter, Rammi Machhana and Gaggu Doomwali threatened them to execute a compromise with Harmander Singh by way of giving the house and land to him, otherwise the entire family will be killed. Then Rammi Machhana asked his accomplices that in case Jashandeep Singh and his family do not execute the compromise within 02 days with Harmander Singh, then eliminate the entire family. Thereafter Harmander Singh (his parental uncle) threatened him while saying that he has good links with the politically influenced persons, so he cannot do anything to him. Thereafter, Harmander Singh, Rammi Machhana alongwith his accomplices, left the house.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that there is no allegation of causing injury by the petitioner to any person(s). The allegation against the present petitioner is same as that of his co-accused namely Randeep Singh @ Randeep @ Gaggu Sarpanch who has been granted the concession of interim relief vide order dated 10.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-57747-2025, by this Court and prayed for grant of interim bail on the basis of parity with the aforementioned co-accused. It



is further contended that the criminal antecedents of the petitioner cannot be looked into at this stage and only the facts of the present case are to be taken into consideration. He further contended that observation made in order dated 01.10.2025 passed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge *qua* involvement of the petitioner in other cases and regarding his custodial interrogation, is directory in nature which exceeds its jurisdiction as it is prerogative of the Investigating Agency whether the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation or not and thus, prayed that the said observation be not binding upon the Investigating Agency. In order to support his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the judgments passed by Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled as "**Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P.**" arising out of SLP (Crl. No.10244 of 2010; "**Prabhakar Tewari Vs. State of U.P.**", arising out of SLP (Crl) No.9209/2019; "**Sagar Vs, State of U.P.**", arising out of SLP (Crl.) No.8866 of 2025; "Paramjeet Singh Vs. State of Punjab" passed in CRM-M-50243-2021 vide order dated 18.01.2022 by a Coordinate Bench of this Court.

4. Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of complainant by way of filing of memorandum of appearance and opposed the present petition on the ground that the case of the present petitioner is not on parity with the co-accused i.e. Randeep Singh @ Randeep @ Gaggu Sarpanch as the petitioner has nothing to do with property dispute which is between the family members and the petitioner



had gone there alongwith his accomplices armed with deadly weapon(s) in order to extend threat to the petitioner and as such, prayed that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required for identification of other co-accused and regarding weapons that they were carrying at that time.

5. Mr. Anup Singh, A.A.G, Punjab appeared on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner while submitting that the present petitioner is a gangster and is involved in as many as 40 cases of heinous crime. It is further contended that the petitioner along with his accomplices armed with deadly weapons entered into the house of the complainant and threatened to dispose him from the property and therefore, submitted that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required so as to ascertain the involvement of other persons.

6. Heard.

7. As per facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner is seeking parity with co-accused namely Randeep Singh @ Randeep @ Gaggu Sarpanch who has not been granted the concession of anticipatory bail but an interim relief has been granted to him, as such the petitioner cannot seek parity on the basis of interim relief and the case law relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioner regarding parity, are related to those for seeking regular bail, as at the time of considering the anticipatory bail, antecedents of the petitioner are to be taken into



CRM-M-67966-2025 (O&M) -5-

consideration; as per contention of learned counsel for the State and record available, the petitioner is stated to be involved in more than 40 cases and it is the alleged qua him that the petitioner is a gangster and came to the house of the complainant to threaten him while the co-accused who has been granted interim relief, is the Sarpanch of the village and is having clean antecedents. Therefore, taking into consideration the allegation against the present petitioner and the relief as prayed for, he is not entitled for the same. However, regarding the contention made on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioner that trial Court has made observation which is directory in nature, in view of this Court the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge made such observations just for the purpose of disposal of bail petition and the same cannot be considered to be directory to the investigating agency.

8. In view of above, the present petitioner is not entitled for discretionary relief as prayed for and the present petition is hereby dismissed.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

03.12.2025
Sonia Puri

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO