



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

117

CRM-M-51621-2025
Decided on : 05.03.2026

Ranjeet Singh @ Love and another . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Hanspuneet Singh Kehal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Ranjeet Singh @ Love and Balwant Singh @ Sodhi	0031	12.03.2025	109, 351(2), 190 of BNS, 2023 and 29/27 of the Arms Act, 1959	Cantonment	Amritsar

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered at the instance of complainant – Harpal Singh @ Bhala. The alleged incident took place on 10.03.2025 at about 11:00–11:15 PM. As per the allegations, co-accused Karan @ DR fired two shots from his pistol in the air and one shot towards the complainant – Harpal Singh @ Bhala, which hit the left side of his pelvic bone. Other co-accused, namely, (i) Karan @ DR, (ii) Ranjeet Singh @



Love, (iii) Balwant Singh @ Sodhi, and (iv) Bittu @ Bhaiya, allegedly extended threats and thereafter all of them fled away on their motorcycles after pelting stones and bricks on the complainant party.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners argues that no specific role has been attributed to either of the petitioners. They are in custody for the last about 08 months and 24 days. Nothing remains to be recovered from them and no incriminating material has been recovered during the course of investigation. It is further submitted that the alleged use of firearm has been attributed solely to co-accused Karan @ DR. Accordingly, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificates dated 04.03.2026 in Court today. Same are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate places.

Copies thereof have also been handed over to the opposite counsel.

5. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the allegations in the present case are serious in nature, as the complainant had sustained a firearm injury on the left side of his pelvic bone. It is further submitted that the accused persons had come together and acted in furtherance of their common intention and had also pelted stones and bricks upon the complainant party before fleeing from the spot.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factual aspects noticed here-above, particularly the period of custody undergone by the petitioners and the fact that the alleged firing has been attributed to co-accused Karan @ DR.



6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

7. Admittedly, the petitioners are in custody for the last about 08 months and 24 days. The allegations regarding the use of firearm have been attributed to co-accused Karan @ DR, whereas no specific role of causing injury has been attributed to the present petitioners. The culpability of the petitioners, therefore, would be a matter to be determined by the trial Court after appreciation of the evidence.

It is also not disputed that nothing remains to be recovered from the petitioners and the investigation in the case stands completed.

8. In view of the above circumstances, and also keeping in view the period of custody already undergone by the petitioners, this Court does not deem it appropriate to further curtail their personal liberty for an indefinite period.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on



the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 05, 2026
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*