



CRM-M-19391-2026

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.109

CRM-M-19391-2026
Date of Decision: 09.04.2026

RANJIT SINGH ALIAS FAUJI

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 169 dated 02.12.2025, registered under Sections 103, 121(1) and 122 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 302, 323 and 334 IPC, 1860) and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Kathunangal, District Amritsar Rural.
2. As per the prosecution version, the present FIR has been registered on the statement of the complainant, who alleged that on 02.12.2025, his brother Jaspal Singh had gone to the fields for agricultural purposes. Later in the day, it came to his notice that the petitioner, namely Ranjit Singh alias Fauji, along with co-accused and other unknown persons, was present near their land in a suspicious manner and was armed with weapons. When the complainant and others reached the spot, it is alleged that the petitioner fired upon Jaspal Singh with a firearm, as a result of



which he sustained a gunshot injury and died at the spot. The occurrence is stated to have arisen out of a prior dispute regarding land and irrigation issues between the parties. On the basis of these allegations, the present FIR under the relevant provisions of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and the Arms Act came to be registered.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has no role to play in the alleged occurrence. It is submitted that the petitioner was not present at the spot at the time of the incident and has been roped in due to previous enmity between the parties. It is further contended that the petitioner had come home on leave on account of his ill health and the same is duly corroborated by CCTV footage installed at his residence, which has been taken into possession by the police. It is also argued that no motive can be attributed to the petitioner and the ingredients of the alleged offences are not made out against him. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate with the investigating agency.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, learned AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the State and, with the assistance of Mr. PPS Mahal, Advocate for the complainant, who has appeared through video conferencing, opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. It is submitted that the present case pertains to a heinous offence of murder and there are specific and direct allegations against the petitioner. The petitioner is alleged to have fired from his weapon at the brother of the complainant, which hit him on his temple,



resulting in his death at the spot. It is further contended that the role of the petitioner is specific and requires thorough investigation. The petitioner was present at the spot and actively participated in the commission of the offence. It is thus submitted that considering the gravity of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, this Court is of the considered view that no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature, involving the offence of murder, and there is a specific role attributed to him of firing the fatal shot which resulted in the death of the deceased. The gravity of the offence and the manner in which it has been committed do not warrant the exercise of discretionary relief in favour of the petitioner. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner appears to be necessary for a fair and effective investigation, particularly when the co-accused Mukhtiyar Singh is still at large.

7. In such circumstances, this Court finds no merit in the present petition, and the same is accordingly dismissed.

8. However, it is clarified that nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

09.04.2026

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