

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

252

**2024:PHHC:005808  
CRM-M-1016-2024  
Date of decision: January 16, 2024**

MANPREET SINGH @ SADHU SINGH  
.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB  
.....Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Arshpreet Khadial, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Additional Advocate General, Punjab  
with SI Rajinder Singh.

Mr. B.S. Jattana, Advocate  
for the complainant/respondent No.2.

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

1. The petitioner through the instant petition filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. is seeking grant of regular bail in case FIR No.191 dated 23.10.2022 under Section 302, 323 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Bhikhi, District Mansa.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that a natural death is being converted into a murder at the behest of the sister of the petitioner, with whom the petitioner has strained relations. The delay of 16 days in reporting the alleged crime further supports his false implication in the instant case. Learned counsel has further asserted that even earlier, his grandmother, who is the complainant in the instant case, had falsely accused the petitioner of murdering his grandfather, however, later during trial, she had not supported the case, leading to his acquittal.

3. It has been still further submitted that the deceased, who was the father of the petitioner, was an alcoholic and had sustained injuries by falling from the stairs; he was admitted to the hospital with simple injuries and thereafter discharged within a day. He died after 15 days and there was no material on record to link him with the alleged murder of his father. A prayer has been made to enlarge the petitioner on bail as, though, all the material witnesses stand examined, however, the trial shall still take time to conclude.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the counsel opposite for enlarging the petitioner on bail. Learned counsel have drawn the attention of this Court to the allegations levelled in the FIR (annexed as Annexure P-1) and submitted that the petitioner on the fateful day was pressuring his father (hereinafter referred to as “deceased”) to hand him the lease money of their agricultural land; the deceased refused as the petitioner was into “wrongful deeds”; feeling offended, within everybody’s sight including the complainant, he picked up a wooden ‘Balli’ and gave repeated blows to the father on his person, including his abdomen and neck; when the complainant rushed to the rescue of the deceased, she too was not spared and was inflicted an injury on the back with the same ‘balli’. After the occurrence, the petitioner fled away. On a hue and cry raised, it was their neighbour who shifted the deceased as well as the complainant to the hospital for their treatment. Since it was a dispute between the family, the panchayat tried to sort out the matter. Though the deceased was discharged from the hospital, however, on account of the multiple injuries, his condition deteriorated, for which he was again shifted to the AIIMS, Bathinda, where he ultimately died.

5. It has been further submitted, on instructions from SI Rajinder Singh, that the grandmother as well as the sister of the petitioner, who were eyewitnesses to the crime in question, while stepping into the witness box, had fully supported the case of the prosecution. Learned State counsel has submitted that the petitioner is a man of criminal antecedents, as is evident from his custody certificate, which has been placed on record. It has been further submitted that earlier also, the petitioner had been involved in the murder of his grandfather, however, he earned an acquittal on account of the complainant i.e. his grandmother, not stepping into the witness box to depose, seemingly on account of the close *inter se* relationship between her and the accused-petitioner.

7. Learned State counsel, assisted by the learned counsel for the complainant, have vehemently asserted that in the wake of his criminal antecedents coupled with the fact that the petitioner has been nursing a grudge on account of some property dispute within the family, there was every likelihood that in case he was enlarged on bail, he could yet again commit another crime, moreso since the complainant as well as his sister-Jaspreet Kaur (PW-3) had supported the case of the prosecution, besides, the petitioner continuing to extend threats of dire consequences to the complainant i.e. his grandmother and his own sister.

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

9. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove coupled with the allegations levelled against the petitioner, this Court does not deem it fit to extend the concession of bail to him. It is a case based on eyewitness account. All the material witnesses including the complainant have supported

the case of the prosecution. The prosecution evidence is still underway and the next date of hearing before the trial Court is 01.02.2024, when some more prosecution witnesses out of the remaining 19 are likely to be examined. Moreover, as per the learned State counsel, all the material witnesses stand examined and now only formal witnesses remain to be examined, the trial shall not take much time to conclude.

10.           The petition stands dismissed.
11.           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.

**January 16, 2024**  
*Jaspreet Kaur*

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned       :

Whether reportable                :

Yes/No

Yes/No