

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

218

CRM-M-16918-2023

Date of decision: 16.05.2023

RAVINDER SINGH**...Petitioner****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****...Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Baljinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gurdarshan Singh Sidhu, AAG Punjab.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.(ORAL)

The present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.56 dated 05.05.2020 under Section 302 of IPC (added later on Section 34 of IPC), registered at Police Station Cheema, District Sangrur.

It is alleged that complainant-Manpreet Singh lodged the FIR in search of his brother-in-law, namely, Soni Singh, who was working as a combine driver and was missing from 5-6 days. Later on his dead body was found in a pond of village Jakhepal. Firstly, it seems that some unknown persons murdered him and thrown his dead body in the pond whereas during investigation upon receiving secret information, it came out that Veerpal Kaur-wife of deceased (Soni Singh) murdered him in connivance with one Ravinder Singh @ Ravi with whom she was having illicit relations.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that statement of the complainant-Manpreet Singh is self contradictory as in his

statement recorded in FIR he had stated that his sister informed him that her husband is missing but the statement recorded before the trial Court as per version of his sister, he said that her husband-Soni Singh had gone with Combine to Madhya Pradesh and also stated that son of deceased told him that his father was murdered by petitioner and Veerpal Kaur whereas in cross-examination he denied. He has also stated in FIR that dead body of Soni Singh was identified by him and his sister but in his cross-examination, he has stated that dead body was identified by family members of the deceased. He further submits that in view of the contradictory statement made by complainant, the entire chain of events has been broken as the complainant had totally mislead the investigation.

Learned counsel further contends that the petitioner was arrested on 05.05.2020 and as per zimni order dated 26.08.2022, the evidence of Naraindas @ Babbu was given up by the prosecution. It is submitted that Naraindas @ Babbu was the same person who had seen and identified the dead body of deceased along with complainant and Veerpal Kaur and his statement was of high evidentiary value. So the witnesses of family members of deceased are not credible and it cannot be ascertained from their testimonies that they had seen the petitioner at the time of death of the deceased and story of prosecution dashes to the ground. He submits no other case is pending against the petitioner and the conclusion of trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the petitioner be enlarged on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by Investigating Officer has opposed the aforesaid prayer on the ground that allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. As per reply dated 11.05.2023, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner was

having illicit relations with co-accused Veerpal Kaur and deceased-Soni Singh, when came to know about their relationship then on the intervening night of 01/02.05.2020 petitioner and Veerpal Kaur in connivance with each other gave beatings to the deceased with iron pipe and committed his murder. He refers to the disclosure statement dated 07.05.2020 and 08.05.2020 (Annexure R-1/T) vide which the petitioner admitted his guilt.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

The trial Court has rightly rejected the bail application presented vide order dated 05.07.2022 which does not warrant any interference by this Court.

Accordingly, present bail application is dismissed.

May 16, 2023

nisha-II

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No