

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

**CRM-M No.27192 of 2023**  
Date of decision: 5<sup>th</sup> September, 2023

Taranveer Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab  
for the respondent/State.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C. in case FIR No.190 dated 16.09.2022 under Sections 304, 201, 34 IPC registered at Police Station Sadar Dhuri, District Sangrur.

2. While drawing the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR, which has been annexed with the petition, learned counsel inter alia submits that it was simply stated therein by the complainant i.e. father of the deceased, that his son Nandu Ram alias Mani (since deceased) had left in the company of one Ram on the fateful day and thereafter the deceased had gone somewhere without informing Ram. Subsequently, a telephonic call was received by the complainant that the dead body of his son was lying by the side of the canal minor in village Baradwal. Learned counsel submits that while getting the FIR

registered, a vague suspicion had been raised by the complainant that his son may have been administered some intoxicant substance, as a result of which he died. He submits that there was not even any suspicion raised, much less by way of a whisper qua the involvement of the petitioner in the death of his son. Learned counsel submits that subsequently, supplementary statement was made by the complainant, wherein he nominated the petitioner along with co-accused i.e. Mukhtiar Kaur and Banti Singh for being responsible for the murder of his son. Learned counsel further submits that the opinion given by the doctor vide report No.8844 dated 06.12.2022 was totally contrary to the case set up by the prosecution, as organophosphorus poisoning was found to be the cause of death of the deceased. It has been submitted that had any intoxicant, as alleged, been administered to the deceased, his viscera report would have clearly indicated the same.

3. Per contra, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, on instructions, has not been able to controvert that while getting the FIR in question lodged, no suspicion was raised qua the involvement of the petitioner in the crime in question and it was later, a supplementary statement was made by the complainant wherein he raised a suspicion that his son may have been injected some intoxicant leading to his unnatural death. Learned State counsel has also not disputed that as per the opinion received from the Chemical Examiner that no intoxicant was detected in the viscera of the deceased.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

5. The petitioner has now been in custody for almost a year, having been arrested on 17.09.2022. Investigation is complete in the case in hand, as challan stands presented, however, charges have not yet been framed and are likely to be framed on 06.09.2023. Since as many as 19 witnesses have been cited, trial would take considerable time to conclude. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court thus deems it fit to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner. The petition as such is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

September 5, 2023  
*rps*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |