

CRM-M-12060-2021

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

**CRM-M-12060-2021
Date of decision: 23.09.2021**

Jagjit Singh @ Jagga

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S.Sitta, AAG, Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this second petition, the petitioner seeks regular bail in case FIR No.16 dated 28.01.2019, registered at Police Station Tibba, District Ludhiana, under Sections 302 and 34 IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case and that after registration of the FIR, the petitioner alongwith two other co-accused, was arrested and in the disclosure statements, their averments were the same with regard to the beatings, which had allegedly resulted into the death of Gurvinder Singh. The learned counsel further contends that similarly situated co-accused, namely, Jaswant Singh and Vinod Kaushal stand granted benefit of regular bail by this Court, vide orders dated 18.09.2020 and 01.03.2021 (Annexures P-6 and P-7). Moreover, the petitioner has been in custody

CRM-M-12060-2021

since 29.01.2019.

On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, contends that the petitioner alongwith the co-accused had committed the murder of Gurvinder Singh and hence, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of regular bail.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

This is the second petition filed by the petitioner, seeking regular bail, the earlier one i.e. CRM-M-30157-2020 having been dismissed as withdrawn on 09.12.2020.

The above-noted FIR was registered on the statement of Gurdev Singh. There is a specific allegation against the petitioner that he in conspiracy with his brother Ranjit Singh and other relatives, had murdered Gurvinder Singh by calling him to his house. The petitioner has been specifically named in the present FIR. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim parity with the co-accused, who stand enlarged on bail.

Keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence and in view of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, this Court finds that the petitioner is not entitled for the regular bail.

Dismissed.

23.09.2021

parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No