



233

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

CRM-M-24159-2026**Reserved on: 21.05.2026****Pronounced on: 26.05.2026****Uploaded on: 27.05.2026****Ravinder Singh****....Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab****.... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Preetinder S. Ahluwalia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Jaiveer Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Bipan Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate,
Mr. Armaan Singh Brar, Advocate
Mr. Rahul Paul, Advocate and
Mr. Joban Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.62 dated 20.04.2025, registered under Sections 103, 61(2) & 62 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25, 27, 30, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Malout, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Sazia Brar. It was alleged that she is doing M Phil from AMITY University. She has one younger brother, namely, Surya Pratap Singh. Both the siblings are unmarried and are living with their father, namely, Vinay Pratap Singh



Brar. Their ancestral village is Abul Khurana, where they have their ancestral property. On 19.04.2025, her father Vinay Pratap Singh Brar and her brother Surya Pratap Singh had gone to their ancestral village Abul Khurana for harvesting the wheat crops. It was alleged that a dispute regarding 20 killas of land was already going on between her father and Davinder Singh @ Rana, Nachhatar Pal Singh and his son Ravinder Singh @ Babbi (present petitioner). Though efforts were made several times for amicable settlement, but the same did not materialize. Davinder Singh @ Rana had threatened her father several times due to the ongoing civil dispute. On 19.04.2025 at about 06:00 p.m., when her father Vinay Pratap Singh Brar and her brother Surya Pratap Singh and their relative Darshan Singh Mofar were returning from taking a round of their land, they were waylaid by Davinder Singh @ Rana, who was on his tractor. There was one more person sitting on the mudguard of the tractor, who was holding a baseball bat in his hand. Her father Vinay Pratap Singh and his brother Surya Pratap Singh and their relative Darshan Singh Mofar came out of the vehicle. Davinder Singh @ Rana and the unknown person with him also came off and started abusing her father and brother. Darshan Singh Mofar tried to pacify both the parties, however, in the meantime, the unknown person gave blow of baseball bat on the face of her father, then her brother also took a baseball bat from his car and on seeing him, Davinder Singh @ Rana took out his revolver from his *dub* and fired twice in front of Darshan Singh Mofar on her father, which hit in his waist. He again fired, which hit Surya Pratap Singh in his waist. On account of the bullet injuries, both of them collapsed and died on the spot. It was alleged that her relative Darshan Singh Mofar had witnessed the whole incident and he fled away from the place of occurrence. Davinder



Singh @ Rana after committing murder of father and brother of the complainant, had absconded. Both the dead bodies were shifted to mortuary of Civil Hospital at Malout. Motive behind these murders was an ongoing enmity due to the land dispute between her father and Davinder Singh @ Rana, Nachhatar Pal Singh and Ravinder Singh @ Babbi (petitioner). It was alleged that all these persons in conspiracy with each other had killed the father and brother of the complainant. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded on 29.04.2025 and the allegations regarding threat given to the complainant by the petitioner and his father were also made. The petitioner approached learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for grant of anticipatory bail, however, learned trial Court after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the petition filed by the petitioner, dismissed the same vide order dated 08.08.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-46381-2025, seeking anticipatory bail, and the same was dismissed vide order dated 14.11.2025. Thereafter, the petitioner approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, challenging the dismissal of anticipatory bail, however, the same was also dismissed vide order dated 28.11.2025 with liberty to the petitioner to surrender before the Jurisdictional Court and directed the Court concerned to decide the bail application of the petitioner, expeditiously. In compliance to the said liberty, petitioner surrendered before ld. SDJM, Malout on 01.12.2025 and is behind bars since then. Now, the petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for the grant of regular bail, however, learned Court after hearing both the



sides, finding no merit in the petition filed by the petitioner, dismissed the same vide order dated 13.01.2026. Hence, aggrieved by the same, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the occurrence in the present case took place on 19.04.2025 between 06:00 p.m. to 07:00 p.m. and the FIR was registered on the next day i.e. 20.04.2025 ostensibly at about 12:05 am. He has submitted that the police visited the place of occurrence and collected the blood samples and other articles from the scene of occurrence. It is submitted that from the bare perusal of the allegations made in the FIR, the only allegation made against the petitioner is that there was a civil dispute going on between the deceased and the petitioner regarding agricultural land. It is submitted that statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. of the alleged eye witness Darshan Singh Mofar was recorded on 21.04.2025 and the only allegation made against the petitioner, is the motive. It is submitted that though it has been alleged that Darshan Singh Mofar was the eye witness, however, he is a planted eye witness as he was never present at the time of occurrence. He has submitted that the complainant was never the witness of the occurrence and she had levelled allegations in the FIR on the basis of the statement made by the alleged eye witness and thus, the allegations made in the FIR, are nothing but a hearsay evidence. He submits that even neither the complainant was present at the scene of occurrence nor she was present in the district wherein the alleged occurrence had taken place. He submits that supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded on 29.04.2025 i.e. 10 days after the occurrence, wherein, it is for the first time, the allegations were levelled against the petitioner regarding threat having



been given by him, to the complainant. It is submitted that the allegations made in the supplementary statement are nothing but an afterthought and the same cannot be relied upon. He submits that neither the petitioner was present at the time of occurrence nor he had played any overt act. He submits that the Investigating Agency had fabricated the evidence regarding the weapon of offence used in the commission of offence. He has submitted that Nachattar Pal Singh i.e. father of petitioner Ravinder Singh had sold the weapon more than two years ago and thus, implication of the petitioner on the basis of false and frivolous evidence having been produced, is writ large. He further submits that perusal of the final report would reveal that the principal accused, namely, Davinder Singh @ Rana, appeared before the Court and made his confessional statement which indicates that he had killed the deceased with his licensed revolver and sought to undertake recovery of the weapon as well as of the tractor. He submits that from the analysis of video, which was recovered from the phone of the deceased (father of the complainant) itself, it is evident that the deceased were the aggressors and had gone to village Abul Khurana with a clear motive of killing the petitioner side. He further submits that after dismissal of the petition bearing CRM-M No.46381 of 2025 seeking anticipatory bail by this Court, the petitioner approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, for grant of anticipatory bail but the same was dismissed vide order dated 28.11.2025, however, liberty was granted to the petitioner to surrender before the Jurisdictional Court and directed the Court concerned to decide the bail application of the petitioner, expeditiously. In compliance to the said liberty, petitioner surrendered before Id. SDJM, Malout on 01.12.2025 and has also submitted his mobile phone, which shows the good conduct of the petitioner and submitted that



nothing new has come on record during investigation. He submits that on 27.04.2025, a second disclosure statement was made by principal accused, namely, Davinder Singh @ Rana, wherein he gives the vivid account of the mode and manner in which the conspiracy was hatched by him, however, there is no whisper regarding any role of the petitioner. He submits that co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Nachattar Pal Singh, has also been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 22.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-41192-2025. He, thus, submits that keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned Senior Counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that admittedly a civil dispute regarding 20 killas of land was already going on between both the sides. He submits that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR by the complainant, allegedly having the motive to be the part of the conspiracy in eliminating both the father and brother of the complainant. He submits that whole occurrence was witnessed by Darshan Singh Mofar, who escaped from the place of occurrence after witnessing the murder of father and brother of the complainant. It is submitted that the FIR was lodged by the complainant in the presence of Darshan Singh Mofar i.e. the eye witness. He submits that during the investigation, the Investigating Agency verified the call detail records of the petitioner. He submits that the video recovered from the phone of the deceased was of the time 06:07 p.m. and the main accused Davinder Singh @ Rana called the petitioner at 06:10:33, 06:11:06, 06:11:19 and 06:22:11 (all p.m.). He submits that these conversations between the petitioner and Davinder Singh @ Rana at



the relevant time when the murders had taken place, clearly speak of conspiracy between both of them. He submits that call details of co-accused Nachhatar Pal have also been collected by the Investigating Agency. He, thus, submits that the occurrence was duly witnessed by the eye witness Darshan Singh Mofar and on his narration, the FIR was lodged by the complainant. He submits that the complainant in her supplementary statement had specifically alleged that the petitioner had threatened the complainant a day prior to the occurrence. He submits that there is strong motive with the petitioner for commission of offence, which is strengthened from the call detail records. He further submits that earlier, security was provided to eye-witness, Darshan Singh Mofar, which has now been withdrawn and thus, prays that the same may be provided again in view of threat perception. He, thus, submits that keeping in view the gravity of the offence committed by the petitioner, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Learned State counsel has also vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR. He submits that the complainant in no uncertain terms stated that it was accused-Davinder Singh Rana, the petitioner and his father, who in conspiracy with each other committed the murder of her father and brother. He submits that though the civil litigation is going on between both the sides, however, the complainant had specifically alleged a strong motive against the petitioner and co-accused. He submits that it is an admitted fact that there were 09-10 telephonic calls made between the petitioner and main accused-Davinder Singh Rana at the time of occurrence. He submits that .30 bore Rifle was recovered from the Farm house of the petitioner,



wherein co-accused Major Singh and his son, namely, Sukhdev Singh, were found, who are the employees of petitioner and the co-accused. He submits that Davinder Singh @ Rana on seeing the deceased making his video, tried to flee from there, however, thereafter, he was not only instigated by the petitioner, but was also provided with the weapon of offence for committing murder of both father and son. He submits that complicity of the petitioner is evident from the call detail records and the weapon of offence recovered. He submits that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-46381-2025, seeking anticipatory bail and the same was dismissed vide order dated 14.11.2025 and thereafter, the petitioner approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, challenging the same, however, the same was also dismissed vide order dated 28.11.2025. He submits that it is an admitted fact that the civil litigation qua the property dispute is pending between both the sides and death of the deceased persons, which now would automatically benefit the petitioner which further strengthens his motive. He submits that the complainant and the only eye-witness, namely, Darshan Singh are yet to be examined. It is, thus, submitted that keeping in view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, no case for grant of regular bail is made out against the petitioner. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. The Court has heard learned Senior counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance. It is deciphered that both the sides were already involved in civil litigation, which is admittedly pending before Civil Court. Admittedly, the occurrence in the present case has taken place on 19.04.2025 between 06:00 p.m. to 07:00 p.m. Evidently, at the time of occurrence, co-accused Davinder Singh @ Rana alongwith



one more person was present on his tractor. The alleged video collected by the Investigating Agency from the phone of the deceased, though the video pertains to the relevant time i.e. just prior to the occurrence, however, death of the deceased persons has not been recorded in the said video. Though the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-46381-2025, seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the same was dismissed by this Court, however, there is no new evidence produced on record after the dismissal of said petition. Charges have already been framed. The custody certificate of the petitioner would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 05 months and 14 days as on 19.05.2026. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Nachattar Pal Singh, has been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 22.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-41192-2025.

7. 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.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and especially the antecedents of the petitioner, the Court is of the opinion that learned Senior counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and 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.



10. However, in view of the submissions made by learned Senior counsel for the complainant and threat perception to eye-witness, respondent-State is directed to provide requisite security with immediate effect to eye-witness, namely, Darshan Singh Mofar and in case, any threat perception is perceived by other witnesses, they may also be provided requisite security. The concerned State Police and security agencies, would ensure the protection to Darshan Singh Mofar and if required, to other witnesses as well.

26.05.2026
ps-I

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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