

IN THE COURT OF SHRI GAGANDEEP SINGH GARG,
ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
BATHINDA
(UID No.PB00295)

CNR No. PBBT010004382026			
	Case No. BA/151/2026		
	Presented on	:	09-01-2026
	Registered on	:	12-01-2026
	Decided on	:	16-01-2026

State of Punjab	Versus	Vikramjit Singh @ Vicky son of Balwinder Singh, resident of silver City Colony, Bathinda.
-----------------	--------	--

.....Applicant-accused.

FIR No.25 dated 12.2.2025,
Under Section 103(1), 3(5) of BNS, 2023,
Police Station Sadar, Bathinda.

Bail application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023.

Present: Sh.Gurpreet Singh Sidhu, Advocate, for applicant-accused.
Ms.Amandeep Kaur, Additional Public Prosecutor for State.

ORDER

1. This order of mine shall dispose of the bail application under Section 483 of BNSS filed by the applicant/accused in abovesaid FIR.
2. It is the pleaded case of the applicant that it is the first bail application filed on behalf of accused. The application is supported with affidavit of Balwinder Singh, father of accused in this regard. The facts of the FIR are reiterated in the present application. It is pleaded that the applicant-accused was not named as an accused in the FIR. The FIR was registered against three unknown

individuals. The applicant-accused is falsely implicated in the present case . It is pleaded that the applicant-accused was not present at the time and place of alleged occurrence. The applicant had not taken part in the commission of the alleged crime. The applicant had not caused any injury to the brother of the complainant. It is pleaded that the applicant-accused has no concern with the co-accused. The offence under Section 103 of BNS is not made out against the applicant. The applicant is having no criminal history. Nothing is to be recovered from the applicant. The applicant is in custody since 12.2.2025. The accused undertakes to appear during the trial and comply with the conditions of bail. Hence the bail application.

3. On the receipt of the application for bail, the report of the Ahlmad of the Court has been called. It is submitted that it is the first bail application moved on behalf of applicant-accused and no other bail application is pending or decided in any Hon'ble Superior Court and in this Court.

4. Notice of the bail application served upon the prosecution. The police challan has been filed in the present case.

5. I have heard the learned APP for the State and the learned counsel for the accused. I have gone through the record of the case.

6. The present FIR has been registered on the allegation that on 11.2.2025 an unidentified dead body was found present in Civil Hospital, Bathinda. Complainant Shabir alongwith Vijay Kumar

met the IO. The police recorded the statement of Shabir who stated that Javed Ali was his brother. Said Javed Ali came to Punjab for his livelihood. He used to work at Deepak Dhaba Bathinda owned by Vijay Kumar. At about 5.45 p.m. when the complainant alongwith Vijay Kumar and Ramesh Kumar were present in the Restaurant then Javed Ali ran towards the restaurant and he appeared from the bushes. Three unidentified individuals followed him and they were threatening Javed Ali. One individual was carrying a brick stone and he threw the same towards Javed Ali. It hit the rear of the head of Javed Ali. The second individual also threw the stone towards Javed Ali who fell down and became unconscious. Thereafter the individual ran away from the spot. The matter was investigated on the receipt of information. Postmortem of the deceased was got conducted. Thereafter on the statement of Vijay Kumar and Ramesh Kumar, the police nominated Sandeep Kumar and Vikramjit Singh alongwith Deepak Kumar as accused vide rapat No.33 dated 12.2.2025. Thereafter the police received secret information about the whereabouts of the accused. On the identification of Vijay Kumar the identity of accused Sandeep and Vikramjeet was established. Vijay Kumar claimed that Sandeep Kumar and Vikramjeet Singh had committed murder of Javed Ali in his presence. The memo of identification was prepared. Both the individuals were taken in

custody. The third individual involved in the present occurrence was found to be a juvenile.

7. It is argued by the learned counsel for the applicant-accused that the applicant has been falsely implicated. He was not named initially in the FIR. He was not present at the time of occurrence. He did not cause any injury upon the person of deceased. No motive has been attributed for commission of the offence. The applicant has no concern with the deceased. It is not explained as to who threw the brick stone towards the deceased. The applicant has no criminal history. The prosecution witness Vijay Kumar did not support the story of prosecution. He did not identify the accused. The accused has undergone sufficient period of time in custody. It is, therefore, prayed that the accused be granted concession of bail.

8. On the other hand, it is argued by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State that the accused is involved in a serious offence. Therefore, it is prayed that the accused does not merit the concession of bail.

9. It is the allegation against the applicant-accused that the accused acted in furtherance of common intention with the co-accused and intentionally committed murder of Javed Ali. I am of the considered opinion that serious allegations have been attributed upon the accused. The accused if released on bail at this stage is likely to flee from the process of law. He is likely to threaten the

witnesses and hamper the process of trial. Therefore, there is no ground whatsoever to grant the concession of bail to the accused. Mere length of custody of an accused is not the only parameter to be considered while adjudicating the claim of grant of bail to an accused. The question of the evidence of one of the prosecution witness is not sufficient enough to hold an opinion at this stage that the accused has been falsely implicated. The grounds of defence raised on behalf of the accused can not be considered at this stage without proof of the same during the trial.

10. Accordingly, on the basis of the findings given above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the bail application is dismissed. The same is disposed of.

11. The copy of the order be sent to the SHO concerned Police Station as well as to the Court of learned Illaqa Magistrate, for information. Record of the learned trial Court be returned forthwith.

12. The bail application file be consigned to the Judicial Record Room, Bathinda.

Pronounced in open Court
Dated: 16th January, 2026

(Suman Bala, Stenographer)

(Gagandeep Singh Garg),
Additional Sessions Judge,
Bathinda/16.1.2026
(UID No. PB00295)