



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

119

CRM-M-72690-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 29.01.2026

Ravinder Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Vipul Jindal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed for further investigation/transfer of investigation in FIR No.107 dated 03.08.2025 registered under Sections 190, 191 (3), 103(1), 238(a) and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Naggal, District Ambala to Central Bureau of Investigation or by a Senior officer.

2. The present FIR got registered on the death of one Akash who was an inmate of Drug Deaddiction Centre. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the FIR in the present case was lodged by one Anil Kumar Maata, a near relative of Akash who was informed about his death by one of the co-owner/Jaspal Singh of the Deaddiction Centre. He contends that although the case prima facie discloses the involvement of Jaspal Singh in the elimination of Akash, the police have failed to conduct the investigation in a fair and proper manner and have, instead, let off the owners and co-owners of the de-addiction centre and nabbed the petitioner



herein. It is submitted that deceased-Akash was admitted in de-addiction centre alongwith Ravinder Singh (petitioner) and other patients and one of the patients namely Ankit was not on good terms with Akash, since he had some type of affair with sister of Ankit. He further submits that the family of deceased-Akash was fully aware of the details of the said affair. Dhruv Berry who is one of the co-owners of the Deaddiction Centre was also not on good terms with deceased-Akash as he did not follow his instructions as regards the mode and manner of living in the Deaddiction Centre. He contends that one Harjot resident of village Daun Kalan, Patiala was the licence holder of the Deaddiction Centre as well as one of the co-owners.

3. Counsel for the petitioner contends that on 01.08.2025, in the late evening deceased-Akash had not followed the instructions as regards manner of living in the Deaddiction Centre, whereupon Harjot(who had online access of the entire de-addiction through camera) called co-accused/Ankit in the Deaddiction Centre on his mobile number 62846-48016 and instructed him to ensure that Akash behaved properly. He contends that Ankit shared the details of mobile call received from Harjot with co-owner Dhruv Berry and thereafter, Akash was given severe beatings by them. On the intervention of other inmates including the petitioner, the matter was halted for some time, however, Akash was beaten again the next day by Ankit and Dhruv. The petitioner alongwith other patients tried to intervene, however, they were directed to keep away as Akash was to be taught a lesson and co-accused/Ankit and Dhruv Berry had received instructions on mobile from the owner/Harjot to teach him a lesson. It is contended that in



the evening of 02.08.2025, co-accused /Harjot in his own car took Akash to Hospital and he was accompanied by the petitioner, Gurjit and Jasbir. The counsel further contends that Akash was dropped at the Hospital and petitioner was informed that he is going to Police Station Naggal to lodge a complaint that Akash had met with an accident so as to cover up the matter and save co-accused Dhruv and Ankit. He contends that Harjot called his other partners of the Deaddiction Centre and accordingly, on the instructions of Harjot, Ravinder(present petitioner), Dhruv, Jasbir, Jaspal and Mohit were brought to the Police Station. He contends that Mohit was let off by the Police while Jaspal and Harjot were not formally arrested, however, the petitioner (Ravinder), Dhruv, Jaspreet, Gaurav, Hardeep and Jasbir Singh were formally arrested. He contends that Jaspal was also allowed to go but Harjot was kept in the Police Staton and given VIP treatment and eventually let off by the SHO. He asserts that the CCTV footage of all the rooms of Police Station would corroborate his version about favourable treatment extended to the accused persons. It is contended that thereafter, the FIR was registered on 03.08.2025 for commission of offences under Section 103 (1), 191(3), 190 and 61 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Naggal against the petitioner and other co-accused including Jaspal Singh. The matter was assigned to the SIT. He contends that the wife of the petitioner got a legal notice dated 22.09.2025 regarding the formation of SIT to investigate the case mentioning all the details therein including the mobile numbers. He contends that the Police has filed the final report against the present petitioner and co-accused Hardeep, Gaurav Singla, Jaspreet, Jasbir



Singh, Dhruv, Ankit Chauhan, Chandan Kumar, Daljit Singh and Prakash before the trial Court, however, the co-owners of the Deaddiction Centre namely Jaspal Singh, Harjot Singh had been given clean chit and Mohit and Gaurav had been found innocent.

4. He contends that there are various discrepancies and shortcomings in the investigation conducted and the final report submitted by the Police. He further contends that as per the challan the investigation was initially being conducted by SI Karambir Singh, SHO Police Station Naggal, despite the fact that the same had been transferred to Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra pursuant to orders dated 18.08.2025 passed by the Senior officers. It is, therefore questionable as to whether the transfer of investigation was duly acted upon and whether SI Karambir Singh was competent to continue with the investigation thereafter. It is further contended that the report was submitted by the SIT comprising of the Dy. Superintendent of Police, Ladwa; Inspector Surinder Singh, Incharge CIA-1, Kurukshetra; Inspector Jagdish Chander, SHO Police Station Ladwa; and SI Sudhir Kumar No.182/A, CIA-1, Kurukshetra, constituted vide order dated 08.09.2025. He contends that the SIT examined co-accused Jaspal Singh and Harjot Singh and after considering the CDRs of their mobile numbers granted them a clean chit in the murder of deceased/Akash Masta. Similarly, other co-accused namely Jaspal Singh and Harjot Singh were also given clean chit. It is further submitted that at no point in time, the SIT joined the petitioner or his wife in the investigation of the case and that CCTV footage has not been taken into consideration. It is also pointed out



that the members of the SIT have not been cited as prosecution witnesses. The Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra to whom the investigation had been transferred is also not cited as a witness by the prosecution.

5. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition with his able assistance.

6. The entire case can be summed up to the effect that the petitioner contends that while he has been falsely implicated in the present case, the suspects Harjot, Jaspal, Mohit and Gaurav have been wrongly exonerated by the Investigating Agency. An attempt is being made by the counsel for the petitioner to impress the Court to draw an adverse inference solely on the ground that the report of the Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra/the inquiry report have not been appended as a part of challan, hence, an inference be drawn that the said suspects have been wrongly let off.

7. I am afraid that such perceptive argument cannot be the basis for this Court to draw an inference that the investigation conducted by the Investigating Agency is faulty and warrants interference, much less to direct transfer of investigation to Central Bureau of Investigation or to some higher officer/official, particularly when the investigation is already complete and the charge sheet stands filed. The pleas of defence and/or the dissatisfaction, if any, of the petitioner on the part of the investigation conducted by the Investigating Officer merely gives him the liberty to move an appropriate application before the Illaqa Magistrate. This Court would not go into



examination of the evidence collected by the Investigating Agency during investigation. It is well settled that the Investigating Agency is only required to append, alongwith the chargesheet, all the material that is being relied upon by the prosecution, during the course of trial, so as to bring home the guilt of the accused. However, the mere failure to append the same would not render the investigation to be interfered with. The mandate to make a compulsory declaration is only with respect to the documents specified under Section 173(5) Cr.P.C. i.e. the documents or extracts on which the prosecution proposes to rely and the statement of witnesses recorded under Section 161 Cr.P.C. of all the persons whom the prosecution proposes to examine as its witnesses. The desirability of appending other documents is not the same thing as statutory mandate to append the same.

8. Finding no reasons to issue directions as prayed for, the present petition is dismissed.

9. It shall however not be to the prejudice of the petitioner to move an appropriate application/petition before the trial Court for seeking redressal of any other grievance, if so advised.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

29.01.2026

Mangal Singh

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