



122 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

1. CRM-M-54583-2025  
Rajat Kumar @ Rajat @ Apple .....Petitioner  
versus  
State of Punjab ..... Respondent
2. CRM-M-62368-2025  
Sharanjit Singh @ Sunny .....Petitioner  
versus  
State of Punjab ....Respondent
3. CRM-M-67654-2025  
Manjeet Kaur .....Petitioner  
versus  
State of Punjab ....Respondent
4. CRM-M-7136-2026  
Kharak Singh @ Ladi .....Petitioner  
versus  
State of Punjab ....Respondent

Date of decision: 17.03.2026

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Mr. Sant Pal Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Vini Rana, Advocate (in CRM-M-7136-2026)  
Mr. G.S. Bajwa, Advocate (in CRM-M-54583-2025)  
Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate (in CRM-M-62368-2025)  
Mr. Amit Bhardwaj, Advocate and  
Mr. B.S. Jaswal, Advocate (in CRM-M-67654-2025)  
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate  
for the complainant.



**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of abovesaid four petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Petitioners have approached this Court by way of filing the present petitions praying for grant of regular bail to them in case FIR No.185 dated 27.06.2025, under Sections 103 of BNS (Sections 113(2), 249(A), 253(A), 61(2) and Section 25 of the Arms Act added later on), registered at Police Station Civil Lines Batala, District Gurdaspur.

3. Succinctly, facts of the present case are that the FIR in the present case has been lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Prem Singh. It was alleged that on 26.06.2025, his eldest son Karanbir Singh along with Harjit Kaur, who was their relative, had gone to Khadoor Sahib to pay obeisance in a Scorpio vehicle. After paying obeisance, Karanbir Singh proceeded to drop Harjit Kaur at her residence situated in Urban Estate, Batala and when Karanbir Singh stopped the vehicle in front of the house of Harjit Kaur, two young men on a motorcycle came from behind at a high speed and opened fire and caused injuries to both Karanbir Singh and Harjit Kaur. Both injured were shifted to Civil Hospital, Batala for treatment where the doctor declared Karanbir Singh dead and referred Harjit Kaur to Guru Nanak Dev Hospital, Amritsar however, her family members took her to ESCORT Hospital, Amritsar, where she was also declared dead. Thus, request was made to take legal action against the culprits. The FIR was registered. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of the petitioners surfaced on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused and hence, petitioner-Rajat Kumar @ Rajat @ Apple (in CRM-M-54583-2025)



was arrested on 27.08.2025, petitioner-Sharanjit Singh @ Sunny (in CRM-M-62368-2025) was arrested on 10.07.2025, petitioner-Manjeet Kaur (in CRM-M-67654-2025) was arrested on 01.08.2025 and petitioner-Kharak Singh @ Ladi (in CRM-M-7136-2026) was arrested on 12.09.2025. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioners approached the learned Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined to them vide orders dated 27.08.2025, 17.10.2025, 26.08.2025 and 14.01.2026, respectively. Being aggrieved, petitioners are before this Court by way of filing the present petitions for grant of concession of regular bail.

4. It has been contended by learned Senior counsel for the petitioners (in CRM-M-7136-2026) and counsel for the petitioners that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present cases only on the basis of disclosure statement made by co-accused, which is not even an admissible evidence. It has been submitted that the allegations against petitioner-Kharak Singh @ Ladi was to the effect that he carried out *reckee* however, the same was after about 2 ½ months of the alleged occurrence. It has been submitted that as per the case of prosecution, the incident arose out of rivalry between two gangs and after murder of Harjit Kaur and Karanbir Singh, a post was circulated on social media claiming responsibility for their elimination. It has been further submitted that similarly situated co-accused, namely, Bikramjit Singh, has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 16.10.2025 passed in CRM-M-55458-2025. It has also been submitted that the allegations against the petitioners are that they have harboured the



co-accused. It has been submitted that out of 04 petitioners, 03 petitioners have no criminal antecedents and so far as, petitioner-Kharak Singh @ Ladi is concerned, he was falsely implicated in one more case, however, after his arrest, he was bailed out in the same by the trial Court itself. It has been submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the cases, the petitioners deserve to be granted the concession of regular bail.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that the petitioners have harboured the co-accused, who fired shots and caused death of two persons. He has also submitted that even petitioner-Kharak Singh @ Ladi supplied information to the co-accused, on the basis of which, after conducting *recce*, the murder was committed. He thus, has submitted that in the facts and circumstances of the cases, the petitioners do not deserve the concession of regular bail.

6. Learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners. He has submitted that complicity of the petitioners was duly established during the investigation, however, he does not dispute the fact that the petitioners have been implicated on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. He, on instructions, has submitted that the investigation is complete and charges are yet to be framed. He has further submitted that out of total 23 accused, 01 accused has been granted anticipatory bail, 12 accused are in custody and 10 accused are still at large. He has placed on record custody certificates of the petitioners.

7. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioners have been arrayed as accused in



the present FIR on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. Admittedly, the injuries caused to the deceased are not attributed to the petitioners. As submitted before this Court, investigation is complete and out of total 23 accused, 01 accused has been granted anticipatory bail, 12 accused are in custody and 10 accused are still at large. Custody certificates of the petitioners filed by the State show that petitioner-Rajat Kumar @ Apple has undergone incarceration of 07 months and 15 days; petitioner-Sharanjit Singh @ Sunny has undergone incarceration of 08 months and 02 days; petitioner-Manjit Kaur has undergone incarceration of 07 months and 12 days; and petitioner-Kharak Singh @ Ladi has undergone incarceration of 06 months as on 16.03.2026. Custody certificate of petitioner-Rajat Kumar @ Rajat @ Apple shows that he is involved in one more case. Custody certificate of petitioner-Kharak Singh @ Ladi shows that though he was involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in the same. Custody certificates of petitioner-Sharanjit Singh @ Sunny and Manjit Kaur show that they are not involved in any other case.

8. 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. The trial of the cases will take sufficiently long time. However, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present cases, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their 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.

9. If petitioner-Rajat Kumar @ Rajat @ Apple (in CRM-M-54583-2025) does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

17.03.2026  
*m.sharma*

( RAJESH BHARDWAJ )  
JUDGE

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