



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

122

1)

CRM-M-68021-2025
Decided on : 09.03.2026

Chhinderpal Kaur . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

2)

CRM-M-2382-2026

Rajpreet Singh @ Raj . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sukhmeet Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-68021-2025).

Mr. Amtoj Singh Dhaliwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-2382-2026).

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-68021-2025 & CRM-M-2382-2026, as both the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-68021-2025.

2. The instant petitions have 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
Chhinderpal Kaur (petitioner in CRM-M-68021-2025	200	04.10.2025	109, 308(4), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and 25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959	Baghapurana	Moga
Rajpreet Singh @ Raj	200	04.10.2025	109, 308(4), 351(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and	Baghapurana	Moga

(petitioner in CRM-M-2382- 2026)			25, 27 of Arms Act, 1959		
--	--	--	--------------------------	--	--

3. At the outset, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificates dated 08.03.2026 *qua* both the petitioners and status report dated 08.03.2026 (in CRM-M-2382-2026), in Court today. Same are taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate places in the respective case files.

Copies thereof have been handed over to learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. A few facts necessary for adjudication of the cases may be noticed.

Complainant – Sukdev Singh @ Seepa is running a Karyana Shop in the village. On 26.09.2025 at 10:26 a.m. two unknown persons came on a black coloured motorcycle and while passing from there fired a shot towards him. Person who was pillion rider was having muffled face and later on complainant came to know that in March 2024, Shandeep Singh @ Sunny r/o USA had demanded Rs.25.00 lacs from him, for which already one FIR had been got registered against Shandeep Singh @ Sunny.

Thus, on the basis of suspicion, the complainant named Shandeep Singh @ Sunny and certain members of his family, namely Baldev Singh (father), Chhinderpal Kaur (mother) and Sukhdeep Kaur (sister), while getting the present FIR registered with the allegation of demanding ransom of Rs.25.00 lakhs.

5. In the present case no one has suffered any injury however, as per investigation petitioner – Rajpreet Singh @ Raj (in CRM-M-2382-2026) had conducted Reki of the complainant, and in this regard gave information

to his brother Dharampreet Singh. Thus, vide DDR No.10, dated 11.10.2025 petitioner has been involved as accused in the present case. Except for the suspicion raised and the disclosure statement, no other connecting evidence has been collected during investigation qua petitioner – Rajpreet Singh @ Raj.

Further in the status report also it has been mentioned that on 09.10.2025, complainant had got recorded his supplementary statement raising doubt against total four accused namely, (i) Mehakdeep Singh, (ii) Opinder Singh, (iii) Dharampreet Singh @ Dharma, and (iv) Shandeep Singh.

Further, as per status report, on 11.10.2025 on the basis of secret information names of some more accused, namely, (i) Rajpreet Singh, (ii) Chamkaur @ Beant, and (iii) Chinderpal Kaur, were added for providing shelter and monetary help to the attackers.

On 06.11.2025, again complainant got recorded supplementary statement that he had received threat from Shandeep @ Sunny, who directed him to handover Rs.20.00 lacs to Varinder Singh @ Sonu, thus, accused Varinder Kumar was also involved in the case.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact, there is no cogent evidence available against either of the petitioners and no injury has been caused to any person in the alleged occurrence.

7. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the allegations in the present case relate to an incident of firing upon the complainant with the intention to threaten him in connection with the earlier demand of ransom. It is contended that during investigation the names of the present petitioners have surfaced and their role

has been noticed in facilitating the commission of the offence. Learned State

counsel submits that petitioner – Rajpreet Singh @ Raj is alleged to have conducted recce of the complainant and passed information to his brother Dharampreet Singh, whereas petitioner – Chhinderpal Kaur is alleged to have provided shelter and financial assistance to the accused persons involved in the incident.

However, learned State counsel fairly concedes that no injury has been caused to the complainant in the alleged occurrence and that the petitioners are in custody since their arrest.

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

9. At this stage, it is noticeable that the present FIR was initially registered on the basis of suspicion expressed by the complainant against certain persons. During the course of investigation, names of the present petitioners were subsequently added on the basis of disclosure statements. It is also not disputed that no injury was suffered by the complainant in the alleged incident.

The petitioners are stated to be in custody for a considerable period and the investigation in the present case stands completed. The trial is yet to commence and its conclusion is likely to take considerable time. In such circumstances, continued incarceration of the petitioners for an indefinite period would not serve any useful purpose.

10. Keeping in view the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **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.

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

12. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

13. **Petitions stand disposed of.**

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

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

March 09, 2026

J.Ram

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