



CRM-M-28340-2025

-1-

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

Reserved on : 23.12.2025

Pronounced on : 15.01.2026

Uploaded on : 15.01.2026

(1) CRM-M-28340-2025

Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

(2) CRM-M-65270-2025

Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Bipin Ghai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate,
Mr. Nikhil Thamman, Advocate and
Ms. Malini Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners
in CRM-M-65270-2025.

Mr. Guninder Singh Brar, Advocate, for the
petitioner in CRM-M-28340-2025.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate and
Mr. K.P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate for
the complainant in both cases.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. This order will dispose of above-mentioned two petitions, as both have arisen out of a common FIR.
2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of present petitions praying for granting them regular bail in case FIR No.189 dated 02.10.2024, under Sections 103(1), 191(3), 190 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 25/54/59 of Arms Act 1959, registered at Police Station Mandi Gobindgarh, District Fatehgarh Sahib.
3. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case



CRM-M-28340-2025

-2-

was registered on the statement of Manjit Singh. It was alleged that he had two children. His elder son Tarandeep Singh @ Nannu (deceased) was of the age of 35 years and was doing scrap work. He had acquaintances with Dheeraj Batta @ Dheer (petitioner in CRM-M-65270-2025), Prince Bhullar (petitioner in CRM-M-65270-2025) and Titli (petitioner in CRM-M-28340-2025). All of them used to visit him occasionally. However, later on his son Tarandeep Singh came to know about their character that they were involved in several cases and were also involved in illegal activities. Hence, his son Tarandeep Singh started distancing himself from those persons. On account of this, they nurtured grudge against the son of the complainant. On 02.10.2024, his son left home for village Badeenpur to meet his friend Tinku in his Swift Car bearing registration No.PB-91R-2974. At about, 06:30 p.m., some passerby called the complainant and told that he is speaking from village Badeenpur and his son had been attacked with sharp edged weapon and was lying in injured condition. On receiving the information, he reached the village Badeenpur and found his son lying in pool of blood. Son of the complainant told him that Dheeraj Batta, Prince Bhullar, Titli, Gaggi and Sandeep Boxer all came in a black Scorpio vehicle and they were all armed with sharp edged weapons. His son further told him that they all dragged him out of his car and attacked on his head, arms and legs with the weapons being carried by them and thereafter, fled away from the spot in their vehicle. After telling this, son of the complainant became unconscious. He was shifted to the IVY Hospital, Khanna for treatment, however, doctors declared him dead. It was alleged that accused Dheeraj Batta, Prince Bhullar, Titli, Gaggi and Sandeep Boxer had killed his son Tarandeep Singh



as he objected to their involvement in bad activities. Thus, request was made to take legal action against all the accused. On the basis of the allegations made, the FIR was registered and the investigation commenced. During investigation, Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh and Dhiraj Batta @ Dhiru were arrested on 05.10.2024 and Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli was arrested on 04.12.2024. Postmortem of the dead body was conducted and the supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioners approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge/Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioners vide orders dated 12.03.2025/19.05.2025/14.11.2025. Being aggrieved, the petitioners approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petitions.

4. It has been vehemently contended by learned Senior Counsel for petitioners Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh and Dhiraj Batta @ Dhiru that the petitioners have been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. It is submitted that from bare reading of the allegations made in the FIR, it is apparent that the case of the prosecution is based on the circumstantial evidence. It is submitted that though the allegations have been made that the deceased before his death informed the complainant about the involvement of the petitioners in attacking him, however, the same is a fabricated story. It is submitted that admittedly, the deceased sustained 23 injuries and there was no remote possibility of his



CRM-M-28340-2025

-4-

survival after receiving such injuries, therefore, the allegations that the deceased was alive while lying on the road when the complainant reached him are totally false and frivolous. He submits that the complainant was allegedly informed by a passerby about the injuries sustained by his son, however, the prosecution has not disclosed the identity of the person who allegedly conveyed this information. It is submitted that the occurrence in the present case took place on 02.10.2024, whereas the supplementary statement was recorded subsequently on 03.10.2024 in a premeditated manner. He submits that the alleged eye-witness in the present case is totally planted and he thus, submits that the incident was a blind murder and that the prosecution has introduced the eye-witness only to falsely implicate the petitioners. He has invited the attention of this Court to the testimony of the complainant (PW-1), who, during his examination before the trial Court, deposed that he neither disclosed the name of the person from whom he received the information nor revealed the phone number from which the call was received. It is submitted that it is also deposed by him that distance between his house and village Badeenpur, where the alleged occurrence took place, is about 03 kms. He, thus, submits that the allegations against the petitioners are totally false and frivolous and the case of the prosecution is virtually without any evidence against them. He has submitted that though the petitioners are involved in other cases, however, in majority of the cases, they have already been acquitted and it is because of their involvement in other cases, the petitioners have been implicated in the present case on the basis of cock-and-bull story. He has further submitted that the complainant has already been examined and the petitioners are behind the bars since



05.10.2024. He has submitted that prosecution witnesses are intentionally not appearing before the trial Court so as to prolong the incarceration of the petitioners. Evenailable warrants have also been issued by the trial Court for procuring their presence. He, thus, submits that petitioners Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh and Dhiraj Batta @ Dhiru deserve to be granted regular bail.

Learned counsel for petitioner Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli has also vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner was arrested in another FIR No.223 dated 18.11.2024 registered under Section 115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 190, 191(2), 324(2), 308(7), 3, 5 of BNS, 2023, however, he has been granted bail in the same. He submits that the petitioner was arrested in the present case pursuant to production warrants. He has also advanced arguments in line with the learned Senior Counsel for the remaining petitioners and submitted that the prosecution case rests entirely on circumstantial evidence and that the alleged eyewitnesses are totally planted witnesses. It is submitted that the petitioner is behind the bars since 04.12.2024 and thus, in the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, he deserves to be granted regular bail.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the petitioners are habitual offenders and they have been specifically named by the deceased before his death, to the complainant. It is submitted that the occurrence took place on 02.10.2024 and the supplementary statement was recorded on the very next day i.e. 03.10.2024.



He submits that the case of the prosecution is not based on the circumstantial evidence, but on the eye witness account. He submits that on 03.10.2024 supplementary statement was recorded and the petitioners have been named in the present case. It is, thus, submitted that no case for grant of regular bail is made out and hence, the present petitions deserves to be dismissed.

6. Learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the petitioners are admittedly habitual offenders. He submits that petitioner Dhiraj Batta @ Dhiru is involved in 17 other cases, petitioner Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh is involved in 15 other cases, whereas, petitioner Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli is involved in 07 other cases. It is submitted that the petitioners have been specifically named by the deceased before his death to the complainant. Besides this, statement of the eye witness has already been recorded, wherein, the petitioners have been named. He submits that recovery of weapons has also been effected from the accused. He further submits that the investigation is complete and the charges have been framed. On instructions, he submits that out of total 31 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificates of the petitioners. He, thus, submits that trial being at the initial stage, the petitioners do not deserve the concession of regular bail.

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the occurrence in the present case took place on 02.10.2024. The complainant was allegedly informed about the injuries having been suffered by his son by some passerby. His testimony has been



placed on record. The complainant already stands examined. Though, it has been alleged that the deceased disclosed the name of the petitioners to the complainant, however, as per the postmortem, the deceased had suffered 23 injuries. The custody certificate of petitioner Taranpreet Singh @ Taran @ Titli would show that he has suffered incarceration of 01 year & 15 days as on 22.12.2025 and he is involved in eight other cases, out of which he is on bail in seven cases and in one case, he has been acquitted. The custody certificate of Amrinder Singh @ Prince Bhullar @ Amrinder Singh would show that he has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 02 months & 11 days as on 22.12.2025 and he is involved in fifteen other cases, out of which in majority of the cases, he is on bail. As far as custody certificate of petitioner Dhiraj Batta @ Dheeru is concerned, as per custody certificate, he has suffered incarceration of 01 year, 02 months & 10 days as on 22.12.2025 in the present case. Though, he has been prosecuted in 14 other cases, however, in most of the cases, he has been acquitted.

8. Rival contention raised by both the sides that whether the case is based on circumstantial evidence or not, would be assessed only by the trial Court on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties. However, this Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. 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 petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

9. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety



CRM-M-28340-2025

-8-

bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

10. It is being clarified that in case the petitioners do not furnish bail/surety bonds within a period of one week from today, their custody will not be counted in the present case after one week.

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

15.01.2026

sharmila

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