

2026:PHHC:018498



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.57623 of 2025

Deepak Singh @ Deepu ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

1.	The date when the judgment is reserved	04.02.2026
2.	The date when the judgment is pronounced	09.02.2026
3.	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	09.02.2026
4.	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced	Full
5.	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Ms. G.K. Mann, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sunil Kamboj, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. S.S. Momi, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under



Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0017	05.02.2024	Division B, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar	302, 307, 427, 148 and 149 of IPC and 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959

2. As per the allegations, on 04.02.2024, victim Harmanjit Singh son of complainant Jasbir Singh had gone to fly kite in the house of his friend Robin Roy. Sometime thereafter, he came back home and told the complainant that accused Parminder Singh Bedi and Aditya Bedi who were flying kites on the roof of their house, accompanied by Jugraj Singh alias Lal had hurled abuses to him and had threatened him. The complainant pacified his son. In the meantime, Robin Roy and Amritpal Singh had reached there and had took the victim along with them in Activa vehicle. When they reached at Sultanwind road, the accused Aditya Bedi, Parminder Singh Bedi, Jugraj Singh and Shamsheer Singh accompanied by 4-5 unknown persons intercepted them. The accused Aditya Bedi made an exhortation and started throwing glass bottles at his son and his friends whereas accused Parminder Singh and Jugraj Singh fired shots with pistols with intent to kill the victim and his friend. One of the bullets hit the victim and thereafter the assailants fled away. The victim was rushed to hospital but was declared to be brought dead.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of dead body of the victim was

2026:PHHC:018498



conducted. The accused Jugraj Singh, Aditya Bedi and Shamsheer Singh were arrested on 05.02.2024. They suffered disclosure statements to the effect that the petitioner along with the co-accused Bunty @ Daljit Singh and 2-3 unidentified persons were accompanying them and the present petitioner and Parminder Singh Bedi fired shots upon Harmanjit Singh. The petitioner and Daljit Singh were nominated as additional accused. The petitioner was arrested on 09.04.2024. He was interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting that he fired shots at the victim with one .32 bore revolver. He also got recovered the said revolver along with 05 live cartridges and the Activa scooter used by him at the time of commission of the crime. The complainant Jasbir Singh identified the petitioner as one of the assailants and recorded his supplementary statement to this effect on 22.04.2024. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. He was not named in the FIR. A false recovery has been planted upon him. The weapon recovered from him is not established to have been used at the time of occurrence. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. His continued detention would not serve any useful purpose. The co-accused Bunty has been extended benefit of bail. On parity, he too deserves to be extended the same benefit. He stands acquitted in another case of murder as registered against him. One firearm injury had been sustained by the victim

2026:PHHC:018498



which was caused by co-accused Parminder Singh Bedi and not by him. The supplementary statement of the complainant that the petitioner had also fired shots upon the victim was contradictory to the medical evidence as well to his own version as given in the FIR and could not be relied upon. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

5. Memorandum of Appearance on behalf of complainant has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who was an active participant in the occurrence. A specific overt act has been attributed to him. He had been duly identified by the complainant during the course of investigation and in his sworn deposition also, the complainant has supported the prosecution version as to his involvement in the crime. The petitioner is a habitual offender as he is involved in another murder case. There are chances of his absconding or committing similar offences, if extended benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that he does not deserve to be released on bail.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have formed membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused and in prosecution of common object thereof is alleged to have opened an assault upon the victim by intercepting him and by causing a firearm injury upon him resulting in his instantaneous death. The allegations prima facie establish his active participation in the occurrence. He has also linked to the act with the aid of

2026:PHHC:018498



Section 149 of IPC. He stands accused of a heinous crime punishable with capital punishment or life imprisonment. While length of incarceration is a factor that weighs with the Court in considering bail, it cannot overshadow the gravity of accusations of murder under Section 302 of IPC. It is only on thorough assessment of the evidence to be produced on record during trial that a conclusion can be drawn to the effect that it was the firearm used by the petitioner or by the co-accused, that had hit the victim and resulted in his death and not at this stage. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. The apprehension that the release of the petitioner may imperil the trial and undermine the integrity thereof cannot be stated to be unfounded at this stage. It is well-settled proposition of law that grant of bail is a discretionary relief to be granted or denied based on specific facts and circumstance of each case and there cannot be any exhaustive parameters set out for considering the application for grant of bail. The factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the complainant is also to be weighed. Frivolity of prosecution should always be considered, and it is only the element of genuineness that has to be considered in the matter of grant of bail. In light of the foregoing legal principles, and having regard to the applicant's role in the incident, the recovery of the weapon of offence at his instance and the reasonable apprehension of his absconding or committing similar offences, this Court



finds no compelling ground to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is clarified that any observation made in this order is only for deciding this petition and shall not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on merits.

09.02.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No