



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

**CRM-M-69757-2025**

**Date of decision :01.04.2026**

**Ravinder Singh @ Kalu**

**.....Petitioner**

**versus**

**State of Punjab**

**..... Respondent**

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

Present :- Mr. Ankush Rampal, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

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

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.37 dated 10.06.2023, under Sections 302, 201, 404, 34 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Lakhewali, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR was registered on the statement of Sarabjit Singh. It was alleged that on 08.06.2023 at about 07:30 PM, when he was present in his house along with family members, one Kala Singh visited their house. He took away his son, Gurbinder Singh, on his motorcycle and thereafter, his son did not return. They searched for his son and then, they came to know that Gurbinder Singh and Varinder Singh pledged the mobile phone of Varinder Singh for an amount of Rs.4,000/-and that amount has been spent by both of them. Varinder Singh was pressurizing Gurbinder Singh to get back his mobile phone and when his son Gurbinder Singh requested him to pay equal amount, he refused. Thereafter, Varinder Singh along with Jani Singh alias Deva, Ravinder Singh alias Kalu (present petitioner) threatened his son. It was alleged that

on that day, the complainant along with his younger son Japu Singh went to



village Bhagsar in search of his son Gurbinder Singh and noticed one dead body floating in the drain. When they went closer, they identified the dead body of Gurbinder Singh. There was injury on the left side of head of Gurbinder Singh with sharp edged weapon. There were also injury marks on the chest and other parts of body. It was further alleged that abovesaid accused have murdered his son Gurbinder Singh and with the intention to destroy the body, threw the same in drain. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 10.06.2023. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner approached the learned Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, for grant of bail, however, after hearing both the sides, the said relief was declined to him vide order dated 12.03.2025. Hence, being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition for grant of concession of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, prays for the grant of bail on the basis of parity with that of co-accused, namely, Deva Singh @ Jaani and Varinder Singh. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the orders passed by this Court in CRM-M-8801-2025 dated 17.11.2025 and CRM-M-8253-2025 dated 17.11.2025 whereby co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Deva Singh @ Jaani and Varinder Singh have been granted the concession of regular bail. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is at par with the co-accused, who have been granted bail by this Court. He has further submitted that on the basis of the parity, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail. He has also submitted that the petitioner is behind the bars from last more than 2½ years and hence, right of speedy trial is miserably defeated in the present case.



4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. However, he has endorsed the fact that case of the petitioner is at par with co-accused, namely, Deva Singh @ Jaani and Varinder Singh, who have already been granted bail by this Court. On instructions, he has submitted that challan has been filed and charges have been framed. He has produced custody certificate of petitioner, today in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest. The custody certificate produced would show that petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 09 months and 17 days as on 31.03.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Admittedly, co-accused of the petitioner, namely, Deva Singh @ Jaani and Varinder Singh who were also named in the FIR have already been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 17.11.2025. Needless to say that every accused has the fundamental right of speedy trial.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ashim @ Asim Kumar Haranath Bhattacharya @ Asim Harinath Bhattacharya @ Aseem Kumar Bhattacharya Vs. National Investigation Agency, 2022(1) SCC 695* has held as under:

“Deprivation of personal liberty without ensuring speedy trial is not consistent with Article 21 of the Constitution of India. While deprivation of personal liberty for some period may not be avoidable, period of deprivation pending trial/appeal cannot be unduly long. At the same time, timely delivery of justice is part of human rights and denial of speedy justice is a threat to public confidence in the administration of justice.”

7.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a recent decision dated



03.07.2024 in Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh Vs. State of Maharashtra, Criminal Appeal No. 2787 of 2024, has held that howsoever serious a crime may be, an accused has the right to speedy trial under the Constitution of India.

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 case will take sufficiently long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail on the basis of parity with co-accused, Deva Singh @ Jaani and Varinder Singh who have already been granted regular bail by this Court vide orders dated 17.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-8801-2025 and CRM-M-8253-2025, respectively. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his 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.

01.04.2026  
m.sharma

( RAJESH BHARDWAJ )  
JUDGE

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