



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

CRM-M-8590-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 10th July, 2025

Ravinder Singh @ Ravi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Ms. G.K. Mann, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Anmol Jeevan S. Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Shiva Khurmi, Asst. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Kuljit S. Bal, Advocate for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.0046 dated 11.06.2023 under Sections 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 of the IPC (Sections 326, 307 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Ramdas, District Amritsar Rural.

2. As per the allegations made in the FIR by the complainant Chamkaur Singh, on 10.06.2023 at around 1:30 PM, a violent altercation took place at the site of the Panchayati land located on the outskirts of the village, allegedly taken on lease by Jaskaran Singh and Santokh Singh, cousin of the complainant. Allegedly, when the complainant attempted to intervene in a scuffle involving his cousin brother who was

cultivating the land, multiple persons, including the present petitioner, Ravinder Singh alias Ravi, attacked him. The petitioner is alleged to have inflicted a Datar blow on the complainant, which landed on his eyebrow, causing him to fall to the ground. The FIR further details the other co-accused joined in the assault and also attacked another person, Major Singh, who tried to intervene.

3. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated, implicated due to ongoing civil disputes relating to possession of the land in question, where the occurrence took place. In support, learned senior counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the interim order passed by the Civil Court on 12.10.2023 annexed as Annexure P-1, where a stay order was passed in favour of co-accused Gurbachan Singh, indicating the existence of a bona fide dispute.

4. It has still further been submitted that the complainant party were the aggressors, who forcibly attempted to cultivate the land under the possession of co-accused, and the petitioner has been falsely roped in out of vengeance. It has also been contended that the petitioner has no previous criminal antecedents and his role, if any, is not distinguishable from that of the co-accused, who have already been granted regular bail. In support, learned counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to Annexures P-5 to P-7, orders of bail granted to the co-accused.

5. Still further, learned senior counsel has submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 27.06.2023. The investigation stands concluded, and the final report has already been filed on 24.09.2023. It has also been submitted that charges have been framed; however, only 3 out of 14 prosecution witnesses, including the material

witnesses, have been examined so far. In this context, it is submitted that there is no likelihood of the petitioner tampering with evidence or influencing the remaining witnesses, and the conclusion of the trial would still take some time.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel assisted by Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate and Mr. Kuljit Singh Bal, Advocate for the complainant have opposed the prayer and submissions of the counsel opposite, by reiterating the allegations leveled in the FIR. It has been submitted that the nature of allegations against the petitioner are serious and the petitioner inflicted a grievous injury just above the right eye of the complainant, Chamkaur Singh. However, on instructions, the State has not disputed the custody period of the petitioner, the stage of trial, or the fact that co-accused have already been granted bail.

7. Learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has, however, submitted that although there was a civil dispute previously, however, the Civil Court had now passed an order in favour of the complainant. On being pointedly asked as to whether on the day of occurrence, an interim order, as has been submitted by the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, was in place or not, learned counsel for the complainant has not been able to controvert the same.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

9. The petitioner has been in custody since 27.06.2023. The investigation has concluded, and challan was presented way back on 24.09.2023. After the charges were framed, all the 3 material prosecution witnesses including the complainant, who was allegedly

inflicted injury by the petitioner, have been examined. Therefore, it reduces the risk of the petitioner influencing the course of justice.

10. The existence of a civil dispute between the parties over the land on the date of the alleged occurrence, evidenced by the interim order passed by a Civil Court, lends some weight to the petitioner's claim of false implication. Additionally, the petitioner is not stated to be involved in any other criminal case, and the co-accused, who is similarly situated, have already been granted bail.

11. This Court is conscious of the nature of allegations; however, further incarceration of the petitioner at this stage, particularly when the trial is proceeding at a slow pace and material witnesses stand examined, would not serve any useful purpose.

12. In view of the totality of circumstances, this Court thus deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner. The petition as such is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 10, 2025

rps

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