



205-2

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

CRM-M-15884-2026

Date of decision :26.05.2026

Jasdeep Singh @ Ravi**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Eashan Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ekompal Sagoo, AAG, Punjab.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.12, dated 27.02.2024, under Sections 302, 307, 34 of IPC and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act (challan filed under Sections 302, 307, 34, 120-B IPC and Section 25 Arms Act), registered at Police Station Punjab Agriculture University (PAU), District Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the police party, while on 27.02.2024, received a secret information to the effect that at about 01:00 P.M., when Suraj Parkash @ Babbu and Harpreet Singh, after boarding on their motorcycle, was going from Hamba side towards the side of Ludhiana, and when they reached opposite side of liquor vend situated on Panj Peer Road Terminal, then they were encircled by Vicky, Kala, Bawan, David, Hardeep Singh @ Ghuggu and some unidentified persons. They started firing in the presence of driver of motorcycle, namely, Harpreet Singh and the bullet hit in the head of Suraj Parkash @



Babbu. On receiving the bullet injury, Suraj Parkash @ Babbu died on the spot, whereas Harpreet Singh sustained bullet injuries. The motive behind the incident was that in May, 2023, a murder was committed by Rohit Malhotra @ Ishu and Gopal Mahajan and in the same, Suraj Parkash @ Babbu was the eye-witness. On account of the same, he has been eliminated. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely, Jaswinder Singh @ Jassi. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 05.03.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 10.07.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of co-accused, namely, Jaswinder Singh. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the order dated 16.02.2026 passed by this Court in CRM-M-53370-2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Jaswinder Singh has been granted the concession of regular bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who has been granted bail by this Court. He



has further submitted that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail. He has also submitted that the petitioner is behind the bars from last more than 02 years hence, right of speedy trial is defeated in the present case.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. However, he has endorsed the fact that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Jaswinder Singh, who has already been granted bail by this Court. On instructions, he has submitted that challan has been presented and charges have been framed. He has produced custody certificate of petitioner, today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest. The custody certificate produced would show that petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 02 months and 18 days as on 25.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Jaswinder Singh has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 16.02.2026. Needless to say that every accused has the fundamental right of speedy trial.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695* has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some

period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

7. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated 03.07.2024 in Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail on the basis of parity with co-accused, Jaswinder Singh who has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 16.02.2026 passed in CRM-M-53370-2025. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

26.05.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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