



CRM-M-70776-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-70776-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 07.04.2026

Ramandeep Singh @ Ambi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. G.S. Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.27 dated 23.03.2024, registered under Section 302 read with Section 34 IPC, at Police Station Rori, District Sirsa.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that on the basis of statement of complainant Jagdish Singh @ Jisa, FIR in question was recorded wherein it was alleged that on 22.03.2024, Lakha Singh brother of complainant went to the house of his aunt (Bhua) Guddi Kaur who was married to Tara Singh in village Rori. One Binder Singh suspected Lakha Singh of having illicit relations with his (Binder Singh's) wife Jaspreet Kaur. Binder Singh planned to kill Lakha Singh and he served liquor to Lakha Singh. After that, Binder Singh quarreled with Lakha Singh. In the fight, Binder Singh, his wife Jaspreet Kaur and other unknown persons killed Lakha Singh by beating him with sticks at around 09.30 pm. Then some relatives informed the complainant that his brother has been murdered and he went to government hospital. Thus, FIR was registered. During investigation, name of the petitioner surfaced as one of the accused in the disclosure statement suffered by co-accused Binder Singh. On completion of investigation, the challan



was presented and the on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 01.09.2025. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing the present petition

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the case of prosecution is based on circumstantial evidence. As per the prosecution, Lakha Singh had illicit relations with wife of Binder Singh, thus motive was also with Binder Singh and not the petitioner. He submits that prosecution has failed to produce any admissible evidence against the petitioner for proving his complicity in the case. It is submitted that recovery of weapons are planted on the petitioner. To buttress his arguments, he has submitted that petitioner has clean antecedents. He further submits that complainant, who is none other than the brother of the deceased, has not supported the case of prosecution. He further submits that petitioner is behind the bars for the last 02 years and 09 days and out of 14 prosecution witness, only four witnesses have been examined till date, thus, the right of speedy trial has been defeated. He, thus, submits that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by learned Counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that Lakha Singh belonged to a different village and the accused in a preplanned



CRM-M-70776-2025

-3-

manner had called him in their village and thereafter in a clandestine manner, Lakha Singh was killed by all the accused. He contended that weapon of offence i.e. Lathi had been recovered from the petitioner and he submits that as on today, complicity of the petitioner surfaced in the disclosure statement of co-accused Binder Singh. On instructions, he submits that out of 14 prosecution witnesses, four witnesses have been examined so far. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that case of the prosecution is based on circumstantial evidence. Binder Singh suspected that deceased Lakha Singh was having illicit relations with his wife Jaspreet Kaur. The evidence relied upon by the prosecution are the recoveries of blood stained lathi and the disclosure statement of co-accused Binder Singh. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 09 days as on 04.04.2026. It further shows that petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Out of 14 prosecution witnesses, only four have been examined till date. *De hors* the gravity of the offence, this Court cannot ignore the long custody of the petitioner as speedy trial is the fundamental right of every accused.

6. As per law settled, speedy trial to the petitioner despite his involvement in multiple cases cannot be taken away. The trial of the case is likely to take sufficient time. Speedy trial is the right of every accused. 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 the 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 sufficient 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 to the petitioner.

9. 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.

10. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

07.04.2026

SN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No