

CRM-M-13648-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

308

CRM-M-13648-2026
Decided on : 08.04.2026

Ranjit Singh @ Raja

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present : Mr. Mahesh Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ranjit Singh @ Raja, aged 37 years	0175	13.07.2023	160, 302, 323, 324, 148, 149, 120-B, 186, 353, 332 IPC and Section 42 of Prisons Act.	Kotwali	Kapurthala

2. After completion of investigation, challan stands submitted and thereupon vide order dated 23.10.2024, as mentioned in the status report, charges were framed by the trial Court under Sections 120-B, 148, 302, 303, 326, 325, 324, 323 and 149 IPC and Section 42 of Prisons Act.

3. In the present case, the incident had taken place inside the Central Jail, Kapurthala and in the said incident, one person namely Simranjit Singh @ Simar



CRM-M-13648-2026

was murdered and other three prisoners/injured and one Warder namely (i) Prisoner-Amanpreet Singh, (ii) Prisoner-Surinder Singh, (iii) Prisoner-Varinder Singh and (iv) Head Warder Bikramjit Singh suffered injuries.

4. Initially, while registering FIR, total 22 accused were found named, however, on seeing the CCTV footage, some other accused were also found involved making total number of accused as 37.

During investigation, it was found that the real motive behind the aforesaid occurrence inside jail was that deceased Simranjit Singh @ Simar had a past rivalry with accused-Vijay Kumar and accused Sandeep Singh @ Sabi. On separate occasions, all the aforementioned accused had fight with the deceased, regarding which number of FIRs already stood registered. At one point of time, when there was hearing in the Court, in regard to some FIR, accused Ranjit Singh @ Raja and Kamalpreet Singh @ Kamal had gone to the Court, where Simranjit Singh @ Simar (deceased in present case) was also present and he inflicted injuries upon the aforementioned accused persons, but no legal action was availed against the deceased.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that neither any specific injury nor a specific weapon has been attributed to the petitioner. However, the role attributed to the petitioner was that he was member of unlawful assembly, and allegedly armed with deadly weapon, thus, there being common object of causing death and injuries to their jail associates, petitioner herein, is allegedly found indulged in the criminal act inside jail.

6. The second argument addressed regarding involvement of the petitioner as accused is on the basis of CCTV footage, wherein presence of petitioner was noticed. The evidence based upon which all the aforementioned

**CRM-M-13648-2026**

petitioner has been made accused after seeing the CCTV footage installed in the jail premises, is mentioned in status report. Certain letters were received at the Police Station from the office of the then Additional Superintendent Central Jail, Kapurthala, in which it was found that the petitioner is involved in the conspiracy of the incident, alongwith other accused persons. Infact, 22 accused persons including petitioner were noticed crossing the gate of Phase-2 and entered the Security Ward-E, where deceased Simranjit Singh @ Simar was confined.

7. In regard to the allegations, the relevant part of status report, which has been mentioned paragraph No. 15 reads as under:

“That it is respectfully submitted that the petitioner is actively involved in the present case as the petitioner, in connivance with other accused persons had attacked and killed the inmate Simranjit Singh @ Simar and had injured other inmates. That from the perusal of the CCTV footage, evidence on record and from the comprehensive investigation, it has been found that on the day of the incident, 21 accused persons had crossed the Gate of Phase-2 and entered the Security Ward-E, where the deceased Simranjit Singh @ Simar was confined and the present petitioner was one of them.

That it is pertinent to mention that the present petitioner alongwith other 20 accused persons was armed with deadly weapons and he had inflicted serious injuries upon the person of prisoner Simranjit Singh @ Simar, which resulted in his death. Moreover, during the aforesaid incident, while entering the Security Ward-E, the petitioner and other accused persons had attacked and injured Head Warder Bikramjit Singh and prisoner Amanpreet Singh, Surinder Singh and Varinderpal Singh, who came to the rescue of the deceased.

That it is important to mention that petitioner and other accused, in order to end the deceased, had hatched a conspiracy and decided to eliminate him and in furtherance of the common object, they came out of the barracks in the shape of mob armed with sharp

**CRM-M-13648-2026**

and blunt deadly weapons and entered into Security Ward-E to cause murder of Simranjit Singh and to cause injuries to four other persons. The motive behind the occurrence is old rivalry between the above accused persons with the deceased.

Therefore, in the light of the aforesaid facts, the role of the petitioner cannot be denied in the present case and the offences committed in the present FIR No. 175 (Supra) and serious in nature which involves the committing of a serious crime against the society. Therefore, it is humbly submitted that the present petitioner does not deserve any relief from this Hon'ble Court."

8. As per the Medico Legal Report dated 13.07.2023 of the deceased Simarnjit Singh @ Simar (when he was alive), total five injuries were suffered by him. Cause of injuries suffered by other four injured has also been described in the MLR. It has further been clarified in the status report that initially total 22 accused were challaned but later on 15 more accused were added and supplementary challan qua them was submitted. It has also been detailed that there are total 46 witnesses and till date, none has been examined and investigation qua one of the accused i.e. Gaurav Giri @ Goral is still pending awaiting challan.

9. Thus, learned counsel for the petitioner pray for grant of bail to the petitioner.

10. On the other hand, Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab, while assisting the Court submit that looking at the conduct of the petitioner, that he alongwith other accused attacked in the jail premises, resulting into the death of one person and causing injuries including grievous in nature to other four victims including one Warder, does not deserve any sympathy or concession for their release on bail. Further submit that if he is released on bail, there is likelihood of affecting the proceedings of trial, and, therefore, same may cause hindrance in the smooth



CRM-M-13648-2026

progress of the proceedings before the trial Court or even there can be threat to the prosecution witnesses.

11. I have considered the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties.

12. Admittedly, nothing could be gathered from the status report presented before the Court today by the State, nor it could be pointed out by the learned State counsel, showing the involvement of the petitioner alongwith some weapon or causing of a specific injury to the deceased or to any of the injured.

13. Consequently, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

14. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

15. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

16. Petition stands disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 08, 2026

reena

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