



CRM-M-67916-2025

1

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

105

CRM-M-67916-2025

Ranjit Singh

....Petitioner

V/s

State of Punjab

....Respondent

Date of decision: 03.12.2025**Date of Uploading : 03.12.2025****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Vivek Salathia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter to be referred as 'the BNSS') for grant of pre-arrest/anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.106 dated 12.06.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103, 238 of BNS, 2023 (offence under Sections 61(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 added later on) at Police Station Cantt Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. The gravamen of the FIR in question reflects that the criminal proceedings were initiated based on a complaint filed by Girja Devi wife of Late Barsati lal, resident of House No.749, Street No.02, near Police Post Daba, Lakshman Nagar, Lohara Road, Ludhiana. The present case pertains to death of a social media influencer namely Kanchan Kumari, popularly



CRM-M-67916-2025

2

found in a decomposed state inside a car in Bathinda. The complainant i.e. mother of the deceased reported the matter to the police after the discovery of the body of her daughter. She alleged that her daughter Kanchan had received a phone call from a man named Amritpal Singh, who had invited her for a car promotion job. At first, her daughter Kanchan refused but later agreed and left home with him on 09.06.2025 at 03:30 PM in a car. Before leaving, her daughter gave the phone number of said Amritpal Singh to the complainant and said that she would return after completing the work. When the daughter of the complainant did not return by 11:00 PM, the complainant became worried and tried calling both i.e. her daughter and Amritpal Singh but their phones were unreachable. The complainant tried again the next day but still could not contact them. On 11.06.2025, the complainant was informed that the dead body of her daughter had been found in the same car in Bathinda. According to the complainant, her daughter had been murdered by some unknown persons. Based on this information, the FIR *ibid* was registered against unknown persons. Later, in a supplementary statement, the mother named accused Jaspreet Singh, Nirmaljit Singh and Amritpal Singh Mehro as the suspects. On 13.06.2025, the police arrested accused Jaspreet Singh and Nirmaljit Singh and added Section 61(2) of BNS to the case. Their disclosure statements led to the involvement of Ranjit Singh (petitioner herein), who allegedly helped accused Amritpal Singh escape to Amritsar Airport to flee India. On account of this, Section 3(5) of BNS was also added on 14.06.2025.



Following investigation, the final report has been submitted before the competent Court of jurisdiction.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further iterated that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor has any injury or overt act been attributed to him at any stage. According to learned counsel, the name of the petitioner surfaced only on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Jaspreet Singh, who himself was nominated later thorough a supplementary statement. Learned counsel has further submitted that no motive has been attributed to the petitioner to commit any offence against the deceased and there is no direct evidence linking the petitioner to the incident in question. Learned counsel has emphasized that no substantial material has surfaced which indicate any direct role of the petitioner in the alleged murder. Furthermore, there is no eye-witness and the petitioner has no connection either with the deceased or with the principal accused. The only allegation against the petitioner is that he allegedly dropped main accused Amritpal Singh at Amritsar airport. Learned counsel has further submitted that the final report has already been presented against other accused namely Jaspreet Singh and Nirmaljit Singh and the trial is still at a very nascent stage and as many as 50 prosecution witnesses have been cited. The conclusion of trial will take considerable time and, therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not warranted. According to learned counsel, nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner and he is willing to cooperate with the investigation and, thus,



no useful purpose would be served by sending him behind the bars. On the strength of these submissions, the grant of instant petition is entreated for.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel (on the strength of advance notice), while opposing the present petition, has submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are grave in nature involving the death of a young woman whose body was found in a decomposed state under suspicious circumstances. Learned State counsel has iterated that the investigation has revealed the active role of the petitioner in facilitating the escape of the main accused Amritpal Singh, immediately after the commission of the offence. This conduct clearly points towards criminal complicity and an attempt to obstruct the course of justice. According to learned State counsel although the petitioner was not named in the initial FIR but his involvement surfaced during the investigation through the disclosure statements of the co-accused which cannot be brushed aside at the stage of consideration of the anticipatory bail. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the petitioner and the main accused Amritpal Singh are absconding which itself reflects their intention to evade the legal process. Learned State counsel has emphasized that the investigation is still ongoing with respect to the absconding accused and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to trace the whereabouts of the main accused and to uncover the full chain of events leading to the murder. Furthermore, the petitioner has a criminal history as he is involved in multiple cases including serious offences under the Explosives Act. Considering the seriousness of the offence, the alleged role of the petitioner in facilitating



the crime and the necessity for custodial interrogation, the dismissal of the instant petition is prayed for.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available record of the case.

6. As per the case put forth in the FIR in question, indubitably, serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. The FIR *ibid* was lodged by the mother of the deceased who reported that her daughter Kanchan Kumari alias Kanchan Kaur Bhabi, a social medial influencer, has left her home on 09.06.2025 at about 03:30 PM with accused Amritpal Singh on the pretext of a promotional assignment. When she did not return and could not be contacted, the complainant got apprehensive and on 11.06.2025 the decomposed dead body of her daughter was recovered from a car at Bathinda. The investigation *prima facie* reflects a pre-planned act involving multiple accused. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was not named in the FIR. However, the material collected during investigation indicates that the petitioner allegedly facilitated the main accused Amritpal Singh in fleeing from the jurisdiction of the investigating agency immediately after the occurrence which clearly indicates his complicity and an attempt to derail the investigation. In the considered opinion of this Court, such conduct cannot be treated lightly at the stage of consideration of plea for anticipatory bail. The fact that both Amritpal Singh and the present petitioner have remained absconded disentitles the petitioner to discretionary relief.



7. The argument that nothing is to be recovered from the petitioner does not carry weight in the present factual matrix of the case in hand. The stand of the investigating agency before this Court is that the purpose of the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not confined merely to recovery but extends to unearthing the broader circumstances surrounding the offence, trace the whereabouts of the principal accused and determining the extent of complicity of the present petitioner. Furthermore, the gravity of the offence coupled with the conduct of the petitioner during investigation as also his criminal antecedents cannot be ignored while considering his plea for grant of anticipatory bail. No cause *may* plausible cause has been shown, at this stage, from which it can be deciphered that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the present FIR. Moreover, the gravity of the offence involving the suspicious death of a young woman and the alleged role of the petitioner in facilitating the commission of the crime cannot be lightly brushed aside and indicate complicity of the petitioner.

8. Upon careful perusal of the material on record and the nature of allegations levelled, this Court is of the considered view that there exists a specific and direct accusation upon the petitioner. The role ascribed to the petitioner is not vague or omnibus, but is rather precise meriting no indulgence at this preliminary stage of investigation. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair



and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. At this stage, there is no material on record to hold that *prima facie* case is not made out against the petitioner. Thus, it is not appropriate to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as it would necessarily cause impediment in effective investigation. In ***State v. Anil Sharma, (1997) 7 SCC 187 : 1997 SCC (Cri) 1039***], the Supreme Court held as under : (SCC p. 189, para 6)

“6. We find force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third-degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders.”

9. In view of the gravity of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, the fact that the investigation in respect of absconding accused is still underway and the necessity of custodial interrogation for a fair and thorough investigation, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail in the factual *milieu* of the case in hand.

10. In view of the prevenient ratiocination, it is ordained thus:



- (i) The instant petition is devoid of merits and is hereby dismissed.
- (ii) Nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case/investigation.
- (iii) Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

December 03, 2025
Ajay

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No