



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

2026:PHHC:064619

**1. CRM-M-15765-2026 (O&M)****Joginder Singh @ Lalu****...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent****2. CRM-M-20157-2026 (O&M)****Amrik Singh @ Amrika****...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****...Respondent**

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	27.04.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	29.04.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	29.04.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Sant Pal Singh Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Deep Daman Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. This common order shall dispose of abovementioned two petitions as they arise out of the same FIR and seek similar relief.
2. The present petitions have been filed under Section 483 of the



Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 by the petitioners seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 191 dated 05.06.2025 registered under Sections 103, 191(3), 190, 61(2) of BNS, 2023, Sections 25 and 27 Arms Act, 1959 and Section 21 of the NDPS Act, 1985 at Police Station City Ferozepur, District Ferozepur.

3. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by the complainant Pawandeep Kaur, alleging therein that she had been married to Ashu Monga for about one and a half years. About 15 days prior to the occurrence, her husband told her that certain persons, petitioner Amrik Singh @ Amrika, who was lodged in Faridkot Jail, and Ashish Chopra, residing abroad, had threatened him with dire consequences at the instance of Yuvraj @ Yuvi in connection with an ongoing dispute and had also abused him over phone calls. On the day of the incident, at about 2:30 p.m., Ashu Monga along with his friend Amarjit Singh and another person named Dev went to a tattoo shop situated in front of the clinic of Dr. Daljit Singh in a Verna car. As the deceased did not return and there was an existing dispute, the complainant reached the spot at about 3:00 p.m., where she saw Shivam Sehgal @ Shanga and Yuvraj @ Yuvi, along with 4-5 unidentified associates, all armed with pistols, fleeing from the shop while firing shots. Upon reaching inside, she found her husband lying in a pool of blood with a gunshot injury to his right eye, as a result of which he had died on the spot. While alleging that accused Ashish Chopra, petitioners Amrik Singh @ Amrika and Joginder Singh @ Lalu, Gurdit Singh and Angrej Singh, in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy, got the deceased murdered through Shivam Sehgal @ Shanga and Yuvraj @ Yuvi, she prayed for taking legal action in the matter. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of the dead



body was conducted.

4. As per the further allegations, on 06.06.2025, a rapat No.4 was registered on the statement of Arshdeep Singh, owner of the tattoo shop, under Sections 103, 191(3), 190 and 61(2) of BNS, Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Section 21 of the NDPS Act, which was treated as cross case. The petitioners were arrested on 10.06.2025. Investigation now stands completed.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioners that they have been falsely implicated in this case. No weapon or incriminating material has been recovered from them. The only allegations against them are of hatching conspiracy. It is a case of version and cross-version. As per the version in cross case, it was the victim Ashu Monga himself who had come to the place of occurrence along with above named Amarjit Singh with an intent to kill Shivam Sehgal and Yuvraj @ Yuvi and both of them had fired shots upon the persons sitting there. It is further argued that the complainant, in her cross-examination, has not implicated the petitioners in commission of subject offences as she has categorically stated that she had never made any statement before the police against the present petitioners and co-accused Gurdit Singh and Angrej Singh. She has even refused that the petitioners were known to her. The petitioners are in custody since long. No useful purpose would be served by keeping them in custody anymore. Moreso, co-accused Angrej Singh, Shivam Sehgal and Simranpreet have already been granted concession of regular bail by this Court. On parity, the petitioners too deserve to be given the same benefit. Hence, it is urged that the petitions deserve to be allowed and the petitioners deserve to be released on bail.

6. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently argued that the



allegations against the petitioners are quite serious in nature. They along with co-accused had conspired to kill the victim Ashu Monga. The petitioners had actively participated in commission of subject offences. They are habitual offenders. There are chances of the petitioners' absconding, committing similar offences or intimidating the prosecution witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. Hence, it is urged that the petitions are liable to be dismissed.

7. This Court has considered the submissions made by both the sides.

8. The petitioners are alleged to have conspired with the co-accused to eliminate victim Ashu Monga and in pursuance of the said conspiracy, co-accused Shivam Sehgal and Yuvraj @ Yuvi had killed the victim by firing shots upon him on the fateful day. A perusal of the record reveals that it is a case of version and cross-version. The specific role attributed to the present petitioners is limited to the allegation of conspiracy and no overt act has been assigned to them in the actual commission of the offence. It is also noteworthy that no weapon or incriminating material has been recovered from the petitioners. The complainant-Pawandeep Kaur has since been examined before the learned trial Court. Learned senior counsel for the petitioners has placed on record a certified copy of testimony of this witness. She is shown to have stated that on the fateful day, accused Shivam Sehgal @ Shanga and Yuvraj Singh @ Yuvi along with 4-5 unknown persons had killed her husband and identified Shivam Sehgal and Simranpreet. She, further, stated that she had not taken the name of either of the petitioners or co-accused Gurdit Singh and Angrej Singh. This witness had been declared hostile and allowed to be cross examined by learned public prosecutor but is shown to have maintained the same stand thereby exonerating the petitioners from the allegations as levelled against them. The petitioners have been in custody since 10.06.2025. Investigation stands completed and their



further detention would not serve any useful purpose. Co-accused, who are similarly placed, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. The principle of parity also weighs in favour of the petitioners.

9. Keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the period of custody already undergone by the petitioners, the nature of the evidence which has come on record in the form of testimony of the complainant, this Court is of the considered opinion that further incarceration of the petitioners would not serve any useful purpose. Consequently, the present petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to their furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds by two sureties to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned and on the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioners shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case or tamper with the evidence of the case in any manner whatsoever.
- (ii) They shall not leave the country under any circumstance without permission of the learned trial Court.
- (iii) They shall appear before the learned trial Court as and when directed.
- (iv) They shall provide their addresses where they would be residing after release and shall not change the same without informing the concerned IO/SHO.
- (v) They shall upon their release give their mobile phone numbers to concerned IO/SHO and shall keep their mobile phones switched on all times.

10. In the event of there being any FIR/complaint lodged against the petitioners, it shall be open to the respondent to seek redressal by filing an application seeking cancellation of bail.



11. It is made clear that any observation made herein above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petitions and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

12. Let a photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

29.04.2026

Wassem R. Ansari

**(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No