



CRM-M-24655-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-24655-2025

Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

Ranjit Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vinod Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Arnav Ghai, Advocate and
Mr. Prashant Kharb Budhera, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ekompal Sagoo, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Himmat Singh Deol, 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.179 dated 10.09.2024, registered under Sections 103(1), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Khanna, District Khanna.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Harpreet Singh. It was alleged that on 09.09.2024, he and his father were coming back from their fields. His father, namely, Tarlochan Singh was on his Activa bearing No.PB-10HH-9992 while the complainant was on his motorcycle and was coming behind him. When they were on their way, Ranjit Singh (the petitioner) was found standing in the middle of the road, who on seeing his father, opened fire at him due to which his father fell on the ground. At that time, his cousin Harjot Singh also reached at the spot and witnessed the occurrence. Ranjit Singh fled away from the spot alongwith his weapon.



Tarlochan Singh was taken to hospital by the complainant where he was declared dead. The motive behind the occurrence was that during last Panchayati Elections, party faction developed between the complainant party and the petitioner, due to which Ranjit Singh inflicted injuries upon the complainant and his deceased father, however, the matter was compromised. But the accused nurtured grudge against his father, due to which the present occurrence has taken place. It was alleged that Ranjit Singh in connivance with co-accused Jatinder Singh @ Tejinder Singh and Kulwinder Singh murdered his father. Thus, a request was made to lodge the FIR. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 10.09.2024. On completion of the investigation, 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 bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the bail application filed by both the petitioner vide order dated 27.03.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case in premeditated manner. He contends that the alleged occurrence took place on 09.09.2024 and the author of the FIR is none other than the son of the deceased. It was specifically alleged by the complainant that the petitioner had shot his father in front of him. Thereafter, the complainant alleged that the motive behind the murder was previous



Panchayat Election and the petitioner in conspiracy with co-accused Jatinder Singh @ Tejinder Singh and Kulwinder Singh killed his father. Supplementary statement of the complainant was also recorded on 10.09.2024, wherein he deposed that co-accused Jatinder Singh @ Tejinder Singh and Kulwinder Singh switched off the CCTV cameras installed at their house so as to destroy the evidence of murder of his father. He further contends that another witness Bikar Singh was also recorded. To buttress his arguments, he submits that the complainant, namely, Harpreet Singh has been examined before the trial Court as PW-1 and Harjot Singh as PW-2. He contends that eye witness i.e. the complainant has resiled qua the two co-accused Jatinder Singh @ Tejinder Singh and Kulwinder Singh against whom he specifically alleged the conspiracy and levelled other allegations as well. He contends that credibility of such eye witness is seriously lost, once he being the son of the deceased has resiled qua rest of co-accused. He submits that presence of the eye witness at the time of occurrence in itself is seriously doubtful. He further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. Both the material witnesses i.e. Harpreet Singh and Harjot Singh have already been examined before the trial Court and in a premeditated manner both have not supported the case of the prosecution qua co-accused Jatinder Singh @ Tejinder Singh and Kulwinder Singh and supported the case of the prosecution only qua the petitioner. He, thus, submits that after the examination of these two witnesses, there is no probability of the petitioner influencing the material witnesses of the prosecution. He, thus, has



submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the complainant is the eye witness and he and other witness, namely, Harjot Singh have duly supported the case of the prosecution qua the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is the main accused, who fired at the deceased. He contends that in examination-in-chief of the complainant, Harpreet Singh, he has deposed that the petitioner has been seen firing at his father in the CCTV footage. He, thus, prays for dismissal of the present petition.

5. Learned State counsel has also vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner is the main accused and both the material witnesses have duly supported the case of the prosecution qua the petitioner. On instructions, he has submitted that out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, 02 witnesses have been examined. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the case of the prosecution is based on the eye witness account i.e. Harpreet Singh, the son of the deceased. He has been examined before the trial Court as PW-1. Though in the supplementary statement of the complainant, three accused were mentioned, however, during deposition of Harpreet Singh and Harjot Singh, they have not supported the case of the prosecution qua co-accused Jatinder Singh @ Tejinder Singh and Kulwinder Singh, but supported the case of the prosecution qua the petitioner.



CRM-M-24655-2025

-5-

Credibility/veracity of the eye witness had been seriously questioned. As per custody certificate of the petitioner, he has already suffered incarceration of 01 year, 07 months & 25 days as on 13.05.2026. It further shows that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. Once the eye witness already stands examined, probability of tampering with the prosecution witnesses, no more survives.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the 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 sufficient 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 to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

14.05.2026
sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No