



CRM-M-68096-2025

1

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

Sr. No.129

**CRM-M-68096-2025
Date of Decision: 09.03.2026**

PRABHDEEP SINGH @ BABBI**...Petitioner****Versus****STATE OF PUNJAB****....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present:- Ms. Gursharan Kaur Mann, Sr. Advocate, assisted by
Mr. Anmol Jeevan Singh Gill, Ms. Shruti and
Mr. Arshjot Singh Mohi, Advocates for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the second petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 0103 dated 29.05.2022, registered under Sections 302, 307, 341, 148, 149, 427, 120-B, 109, 473, 212 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, Sections 25(1)A, 27, 54 and 59 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Section 52-A of the Prison Act, 1894, at Police Station City-1, Mansa, District Mansa, Punjab, during the pendency of trial.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the present case was registered on the statement of complainant Balkaur Singh, who stated that his son Subhdeep Singh @ Moose Wala, a well-known singer, had earlier contested the Vidhan Sabha election on a Congress Party ticket and had been receiving threatening calls from gangsters demanding ransom, particularly from the Lawrence Bishnoi group and other gangster groups. On



29.05.2022, when his son was at home, Gurwinder Singh and Gurpreet Singh, residents of village Moosa, came to his house and thereafter Subhdeep Singh left with them in his Thar vehicle bearing registration No. PB-65-AN-9713. The complainant followed them along with his gunmen. When they reached near village Jawaharke, a Corola car bearing registration No. DL-4-CAE-3414 carrying four persons started following the vehicle of his son, and a Bolero bearing registration No. PB-05-AP-6114 with four persons parked nearby intercepted the Thar. The occupants of both vehicles encircled the Thar and fired multiple shots at Subhdeep Singh, after which the assailants fled from the spot. The complainant reached the spot and found his son lying on the driver's seat with multiple firearm injuries, while Gurwinder Singh and Gurpreet Singh were also lying injured in the vehicle. Subhdeep Singh was taken to Civil Hospital, Mansa, where he was declared dead, leading to the registration of the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that vide order dated 01.08.2025, the first bail application filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court while observing that it would be appropriate to await the recording of statements of the eye-witnesses before the request for regular bail is considered. It is contended that now the statements of the eye-witnesses have been recorded and, therefore, the petitioner deserves to be released on bail. It is further argued that the only role attributed to the petitioner in the present case is that he had allegedly conducted reconnaissance (reiki) and disclosed the location of the deceased to the main accused. No gunshot injury has been attributed to the petitioner and he was not present at the spot at the time of the occurrence. It is further submitted



that the petitioner has been in custody for the last three years and nine months, the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude and, therefore, the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the bail application on the ground that the statements of only two eye-witnesses have been recorded so far, whereas the statement of the complainant, who is the father of the deceased and a material witness in the present case, has been recorded only partly and his further examination is still pending. It is contended that in view of the observations made by the Coordinate Bench of this Court in its order dated 01.08.2025, the petitioner is not entitled to be released on bail at this stage. It is further submitted that the petitioner has played an important role in the commission of the offence by conniving with the main accused persons and by disclosing the location of the deceased, which facilitated the co-accused in committing the murder of the deceased. The petitioner allegedly provided the location details of the deceased, which enabled the assailants to intercept and carry out the attack, and therefore considering the seriousness of the allegations, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case. Vide order dated 01.08.2025, the earlier bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court while observing that it would be appropriate to await the recording of statements of the eye-witnesses before considering the request for grant of regular bail. From the status of the trial, it emerges that although some witnesses have been examined, PW-3 Balkaur Singh, father of the deceased and the complainant



in the present case, who is a material witness, has only been partly examined and his further examination has been deferred. Thus, the material testimony in the case is still in the process of being recorded. The allegations in the present case relate to a well-planned and brutal murder, wherein the deceased was intercepted and fired upon by the assailants. The role attributed to the petitioner is that he allegedly conducted reiki and provided the location details of the deceased to the main accused persons, thereby facilitating the execution of the crime. Such allegations, if proved, indicate active participation in the conspiracy leading to the commission of a grave and heinous offence.

6. Considering the seriousness and gravity of the offence, the stage of the trial and the fact that the testimony of the complainant-who is a crucial witness has not yet been fully recorded, this Court is of the view that no ground is made out to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner at this stage. Consequently, the present second petition seeking regular bail is dismissed on merits.

7. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

09.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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