



122

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

CRM-M No.37872 of 2025

Date of Decision: 18.03.2026

Ranjeet Singh Rinku

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Karandeep Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present second petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.49, dated 11.06.2024, under Sections 307, 324, 148, 149 IPC (Section 201 IPC vide report No.15 dated 13.08.2024, Section 34 IPC vide report No.29 dated 06.09.2024 added later on and Sections 148/149 deleted lateron), registered at Police Station Mehna, District Moga.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Amarjit Singh @ Jeet Singh. It was alleged that on 08.06.2024 in the evening, the complainant along with his uncle, namely, Surjit Singh and his friend, namely, Sahil were travelling in his Swift car and when they reached at



Grain Market, Moga, his uncle, Surjit Singh saw Baru Khan. Surjit Singh has a joint business of bitumen with Baru Khan and he has to get money from Baru Khan. When uncle of complainant, namely, Surjit Singh demanded money from Baru Khan, then he asked Surjit Singh to come at Lohara Chowk, where he would give the money. At about 05:00 P.M., they reached at Lohara Chowk and in the meantime, one Bolero pickup car bearing registration No.PB 29D 9480 stopped. Rinku (petitioner), who was holding *Khanda* and two other unknown persons got down from the vehicle. Thereafter one another Bolero pickup bearing registration No.PB 06F 9291 came there, in which Baru Khan was there and he got down from the vehicle. Baru Khan was holding an iron rod in his hand and he gave blow of the same on the Swift car, thereby smashing windshield of the car and told that they will teach a lesson for demanding money. Thereafter, one unknown person caught hold of the complainant from his hand and then, Rinku (petitioner) gave three repeated *Khanda* blows with an intention to kill, which hit on the center, left and right side of his head. Ravi caught hold his friend Sahil and then, Baru Khan also gave three iron rod blows, which hit on the center, left and right side of his head. They also gave beatings to uncle of complainant, namely, Surjit Singh. On raising alarm, people gathered and all the accused fled away from the spot in their vehicles along with their weapons. The complainant and his friend, namely, Sahil was got admitted in Medicity Hospital near Baghipura by his uncle, Surjit Singh. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against both the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the



petitioner was arrested on 11.06.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan has been presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Moga 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, Moga dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 07.08.2024. Being aggrieved, the petitioner earlier approached this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing CRM-M-49938-2024, however the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 25.03.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is again before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present second petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that from the case of the prosecution, it is apparent that the motive is with the co-accused, namely, Baru Khan, who is already on bail. He has submitted that the petitioner has been arrested in the present case on 11.06.2024 and since then, he is behind bars. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the complainant-injured, namely, Amarjit Singh, in the present case is behind bars in a case registered under Section 302 IPC. He has submitted that the trial is being delayed only in order to prolong the incarceration of the petitioner. He has submitted that the prosecution has not produced the complainant in the present case before the learned trial Court as he is already facing the prosecution in a murder case. He has submitted that though the petitioner



was falsely implicated in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case. He has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner is the main accused, who has given 03 Khanda blows on the head of the complainant, namely, Amarjit Singh and these injuries were declared to be dangerous to life. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. He has submitted that as the complainant is behind bars in a murder case, hence, he could not be examined so far. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 11.06.2024. the complainant-injured is already behind bars in a murder case. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 08 months and 30 days as on 17.03.2026. It further reflects that though the petitioner is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in that case. Out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined so far. The Court finds that the petitioner has a right of speedy trial but the complainant being behind bars has not been examined so far.

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. 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 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 his 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 cases.

18.03.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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