



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

216

CRM-M-54087-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.09.2025

Ravinder Singh @ DC and Another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG Punjab

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.04 dated 14.01.2024, registered under Sections 302, 34 and 120-B IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act (Offence under Section 212 IPC added later on) at Police Station Jhabhal, District Tarn Taran.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioners allege false implication in the case. The maximum sentence for the offences that are alleged against them, is 5 years and they have undergone 1 year and about 7/8 months respectively. Co-accused namely Jugraj Singh @ Yuvi, who was similar circumstanced and had been nominated in the FIR together with them vide rapat No.25 dated 22.01.2024, has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 12.09.2025, Annexure P-1. Charges have been framed on 18.05.2024, however, out of 31 prosecution witnesses, only 14 have been examined. Petitioner No.1 is involved in 2 more cases under IPC while petitioner No.2 in 1 under NDPS, wherein they are on bail.



Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificates dated 27/29.02.2025, filed by the learned State counsel are taken on record. As per the same, the petitioners are behind bars for 1 year, 6 months, 20 days and 1 year, 7 months, 28 days respectively.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the petitioners are intentionally harbored the culprits, who had committed the murder of the deceased-Avan Kumar. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case, co-accused having been granted bail and the petitioners being on bail in other cases.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court, etc."

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioners are in custody for the last 1 year, 6 months, 20 days and 1 year, 7 months, 28 days respectively; on bail in other cases; co-accused has been enlarged on bail; charges have been framed on 18.05.2024, however, out of 31 prosecution witnesses only 14 have been examined so far, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioners would be violative of his



right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

8. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioners will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioners will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioners will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioners shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, they are accused, or for commission of which they are suspected of.
- (v) The petitioners shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioners shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioners shall furnish their address and mobile number by way of an affidavit to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, he seeks to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioners shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioners.

9. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioners by this order.



10. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

29.09.2025

M.Kamra

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