



215

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

CRM-M-43677-2025

Date of Decision: 19.08.2025

RAVINDER SINGH

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Sahil Parmar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner is praying for regular bail in case FIR No.17, dated 06.02.2025, registered at Police Station Beas, District Amritsar, under Sections 125 and 111 of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 and 54 of Arms Act, 1959.

2. The present case was registered on the basis of statement given to the police by Kuldeep Singh with the allegation that his sons Paramjeet Singh and Premjeet Singh are residing in Canada. On 03.02.2025, he was present at his home and at around 10:30 PM, he heard sound of three gunshots near the gate of the house. He checked CCTV footage and saw that unknown persons had fired three gunshots in the air in front of the house and thereafter, fled away on a motor cycle. Later on, he came to know that these gunshots were fired by Gurjant Singh who has formed his own gang and indulges in extortion and other serious crimes with an intention to intimidate him. Petitioner was arrested on 11.02.2025 on the



basis of disclosure statement of Honey Boxer @ Anish and he is in custody since then. Several other accused were also arrested and after completion of investigation, challan has been presented.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that he has been falsely implicated in the present case. The occurrence in question had taken place on 03.02.2025 but he was already in custody in FIR No.19 dated 29.01.2025, under Sections 25 of Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Sadar Kotkapura, District Faridkot since 29.01.2025 and he was released on bail vide order dated 02.05.2025 whose copy has been placed on file today. Learned counsel next contended that since petitioner was already in custody in some other case, there is no possibility of his having fired gunshots or conducted recci of the house of complainant as has been alleged. Learned counsel further contended that petitioner is in custody since 13.02.2025. Challan has already been presented. Trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude and petitioner thus be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that the petitioner had committed heinous offence and he does not deserve the concession of bail.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned State counsel and have gone through the material collected by the police during investigation.

6. As per copy of bail order dated 02.05.2025 passed in FIR No.19 dated 29.01.2025, Police Station Sadar Kotkapura, District Faridkot passed by the Court of JMIC, Faridkot, the petitioner was in custody in the above said FIR since 29.01.2025 and he was ordered to be



released on bail vide order dated 02.05.2025 whereas the occurrence in question had taken place on 03.02.2025. Even, Ld. Trial Court while dismissing the bail application has observed that weapon used in committing the present crime has been recovered in FIR No.19/2025 but the weapon could not have been recovered on 29.01.2025 as occurrence had taken place on 03.02.2025. Challan has already been presented. Trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude and no useful purpose will be served to retain the petitioner in custody.

7. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

19.08.2025

Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No