



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

**CRM-M-41706-2025**

**Date of Decision:-21.08.2025**

**Randeep Singh.**

.....Petitioner.

Vs.

**State of Punjab.**

.....Respondent.

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present:- Mr. PBS Goraya, Advocate with  
Mr. S.S. Bhullar, Advocate and  
Mr. SPS Sandhu, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Harkanwar Jeet Singh, AAG Punjab.

\*\*\*

**JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)**

The prayer in this second petition under Section 483 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for the grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.12 dated 23.01.2023 under Sections 302, 457, 148, 149 and (452 deleted) of IPC registered at Police Station Sarhali, District Tarn Taran.

2. The present FIR came to be registered at the instance of Prabhjot Kaur and reads as under:-

“ *Statement of Prabhjot Kaur wife of Baljinder Singh S/o Ram Singh r/o 'Jatta' Police 'Station Sarhali' Distt. were Tarn Taran, aged 35 years, mobile no.7347315615. stated that I am resident of above mentioned address and in the year 2008 my marriage was solemnized with Baljinder Singh s/o Ram Singh r/o 'Jatta' and we blessed with a son namely Abhisar and a daughter Parampreet. My husband is a mason and for the last 6 months, construction is going on in our house and due to this reason I along with my*



*family are residing in the house of Harjinder Singh s/o Bhagwant Singh r/o 'Jatta'. That today, we all family members were present in the house that our neighbour Sarabjeet Singh s/o Harnam Singh r/o 'Jatta' was altercating with his wife in their house. Time was 7:30 P.M and I and my husband Baljinder Singh went to the house of Sarabjit Singh to stop them from fighting but Sarabjit Singh started altercating with my husband and I brought my husband back to our house. The outer gate of our house was open and electric bulb were on in our house and I, my husband Baljinder Singh, Harjinder Singh, his wife Rajinder Kaur and mother Gyan Kaur were sitting in the court yard and talking, time was 7:15 P.M, that Sarbjit Singh, Satnam Singh and Harjit Singh sons of Harnam Singh who were carrying knives, Karajdeep Singh, Randeep Singh sons of Satnam Singh, Ranjit Singh s/o Harjit Singh who were armed with dangs and Sukhi wife of Harjit Singh empty handed r/o 'Jatta' entered our house and immediately Sukhi wife of Harjit Singh raised lalkara and said 'catch hold of Baljinder Singh, he should not go unhurt and teach him a lesson for interfering in our house'. In the meantime, my husband Baljinder Singh got up then Sarbjit Singh, Satnam Singh and Harjit Singh gave knife blows in the stomach of Baljinder Singh hitting him in his left flank. My husband fell down on the ground then Karajdeep Singh and Randeep Singh gave blows with their respective dangs on the backside of head of my husband Baljinder Singh. My husband got soaked in blood. All the accused ran away from the spot with their respective weapons. This entire occurrence was witnessed by me, Harjinder Singh, Manjinder Kaur and Gyan kaur. That after arranging a vehicle, I along with Harjinder Singh brought my husband Baljinder Singh to Baba Basta Singh Baba Kartar Singh charitable hospital, Rasulpor, Patti road Tarn Taran but doctors declared him brought dead after checking him. I was going to inform you that you met us on the way. Statement given, legal action be taken. SD/ Prabhjot Kaur."*

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. Taking the



allegations to be correct both Karajdeep Singh and Randeep Singh (petitioner) have been attributed the same injury with a *dang* on the head of the deceased Baljinder Singh. The said injury is not fatal and it would be a moot point during the course of the Trial as to which of the accused has caused that single injury. As the petitioner is in custody since 12.02.2023 but only 10 of the 26 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far, the trial of the present case is not likely to be concluded anytime soon and therefore, he is entitled to the concession of bail.

4. The learned State counsel on the other hand has filed short reply by way of affidavit dated 20.08.2025 of Mr. Lovkesh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police Sub Division Patti, District Tarn Taran in the court today, which is taken on record. While referring to the reply he contends that as per the allegations both the petitioner and one Karajdeep Singh caused injuries on the head of the deceased though the said single injury is not a fatal injury. The nature of the allegations levelled against the petitioner do not entitle him to the concession as prayed for, more so when the instant petition is the second one seeking the similar relief, the first one having been withdrawn on 14.10.2024. He however, concedes that the petitioner is in custody since 12.02.2023 and only 10 of the 26 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

6. Admittedly, as per the case of the prosecution both the petitioner as well as Karajdeep Singh have been attributed the same injury on the head of the deceased. It would be moot point during the course of the Trial as to which of the accused had actually caused the said injury. The petitioner is in custody since 12.02.2023 but only 10 of the 26 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, his further incarceration is



CRM-M-41706-2025

#4#

not required.

7. Thus without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner-**Randeep Singh** son of Sh. Satnam Singh is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. If the petitioner or any of his family members/associates make any attempt to contact/threaten/intimidate the witnesses in the present case, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of bail granted vide this Court.

9. In addition, the petitioner (or anyone on his behalf) shall prepare FDR in the sum of Rs.50,000/- and deposit the same with the Trial Court. The same would be liable to be forfeited as per law in case of the absence of the petitioner from trial without sufficient cause.

10. The petitions stand disposed of.

( JASJIT SINGH BEDI )  
JUDGE

**August 21, 2025**

Vinay

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>