

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

**CRM-M-15729 of 2015  
Date of Decision: May 27, 2015**

Gurvinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH**

Present: Mr. J.S. Mehndiratta, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. C.S. Brar, DAG, Punjab.

**FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.**

In this second regular bail application of the petitioner accused husband-Gurvinder Singh the prosecution's allegations are that the marriage took place between the petitioner and deceased Upinderjit Kaur on 31.3.2013, out of which a male child was born to the couple. It is alleged that deceased Upinderjit Kaur was caught talking to a person having mobile No.9896518251 in the name of one Mandeep Gill @ Harman Gill to whom the petitioner-husband claimed to be the paramour of his wife. It is on 4.3.2014 around 5 p.m. as per the allegations of the prosecution accused husband Gurvinder Singh, his father Amrik Singh, mother Manjit Kaur and brother-in-law Jaspreet Singh have murdered Upinderjit Kaur by setting her on fire.

It has been contended on behalf of the petitioner that co-accused Amrik Singh father of the present petitioner, who is similarly placed had been allowed bail by this Court vide orders dated 29.5.2014 and further that there has been contradictory stand of the wife in her

two statements made before the Police relied upon as Annexures P/2 and P/3 and which arguments have been controverted by the learned State counsel on the grounds that the first statement recorded on 4.3.2014 was a procured one and that the actual statement has been recorded on 7.3.2014 which implicates each of the accused and that the trial is underway.

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Charges against the accused have already been framed. The petitioner-husband as per these allegations has been accused being the prime person in the commission of this offence. The veracity and the truthfulness of the two dying declarations are matters within the domain of the trial Court. Since the charges have already been framed and that the apprehension of the State that if allowed bail would stifle the trial certainly is not unfounded. Thus, in the light of the prima facie allegations and the heinousness of the offence, no case to grant the regular bail is made out. The present petition, as such, stands dismissed.

**(FATEH DEEP SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

**May 27, 2015**  
*aarti*