



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101

CRA-D-132-2025
Date of Decision: 07.03.2026

Rajanpreet Singh ...Appellant

Versus

National Investigation Agency ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR

Present: Mr. Bhupinder Ghai, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. S.S. Sandhu, Special Public Prosecutor for respondent-NIA.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

RC No.	Dated	Police Station	Section
01/2022/ NIA/DLI	13.01.2022	Division No. 5, Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana, Punjab	302, 307, 124A, 120-B IPC; 13, 15, 16, 18, 18-B of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967; 3, 4, 5 of Explosive Substances Act, 1908 and 3 & 4 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984
Criminal Case number before the Sessions Court		CIS No. BA/4053/2024 CNR No. PBSA01010077-2024	
Date of Decision		09.01.2025	

1. Aggrieved by the dismissal of regular bail by the Special Judge, NIA, Punjab, SAS Nagar, Mohali, vide order dated 09.01.2025, the appellant had come before this Court by filing the present appeal, seeking bail in the FIR mentioned above.
2. Per the custody certificate dated 05.03.2026, the appellant has clean antecedents.
3. The facts of the case are being taken from reply dated 14.05.2025 filed by the National Investigation Agency through its Inspector. On 23.12.2021, at around 12:30 hours i.e. noon, an explosion took place in a bathroom situated near Court Room No.14 in the District Court Complex, Ludhiana. One person died in such explosion, who later on was found to be handler of the terrorist organizations and five persons also got injured. Based on such blast, an FIR was registered by the Punjab Police.



4. By order dated 11.01.2021, the Central Government transferred the matter to the National Investigation Agency where a new number was assigned to the case.

5. The person who died at the spot was identified as Gagandeep Singh, a dismissed Head Constable of the Punjab Police and during investigation he was found to be handler of the bomb. The investigation also found involvement of Pakistan-based smugglers and receipt of the bomb from such smugglers.

6. The investigation continued and present appellant -Rajan Preet Singh was arraigned as an accused based on the disclosure of Dilbag Singh during investigation. The allegations against Rajan Preet Singh are that he was the main person, who had handed over the bomb to the handler and he was also doing recce of the location and was fully involved in the conspiracy. The investigation also revealed that Lakhbir Singh Rode, Head of Khalistan Liberation Force and International Sikh Youth Federation had planned to execute IED blasts at various places in Punjab and the explosion was part of the said conspiracy. It has also been mentioned in paragraph No.10 that applicant Rajan Preet Singh (A-4) was involved and working on the direction of Surmukh Singh (A-2).

7. We have heard counsel for the appellant Rajan Preet Singh as well as the counsel for National Investigation Agency and have gone through the contents of the appeal and the reply filed by the National Investigation Agency, its analysis would lead to the following outcome.

8. By order dated 08.07.2024, the Special Judge, NIA Court had framed charges against the accused including against the present appellant -Rajan Preet Singh. The charges were also of criminal conspiracy. The criminal conspiracy is again highlighted because as per the order sheets handed over by the counsel for the NIA to the Court, the matter was adjourned on 32 dates and out of which for 27 dates, the matter was adjourned because counsel for Rajan Preet Singh was absent.

9. We are not oblivious of the consideration that in a case involving multiple accused, one or other such accused who has a weaker case tried to delay the matter by artificially creating the right of delay in trial guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and the present matter is one such instance. The fact is that the trial is pending not because of the delay totally attributed to NIA or the Court but on 27 occasions, the counsel for Rajan Preet Singh was absent. The accused Rajan Preet Singh did not file any application to give him a legal aid counsel or to change the counsel. Thus, on the face of it, it shows a conspiracy and purposeful absence of the counsel on behalf of Rajan Preet Singh to delay the trial and now he has come up before this Court contending that the trial is delayed and one such ground for bail is the delay in trial.



10. There is evidence of the appellant’s involvement with Pakistan-based smugglers and the recovery of large amounts of ammunition from them. Thus, in the entirety of facts and circumstances, the appellant is neither entitled to bail on merits nor on delay in custody.
11. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.
12. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)
JUDGE

07.03.2026
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned	YES
Whether reportable	NO