



CRM-M-14937-2024

-1-

210

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

**CRM-M-14937-2024
Date of Decision: 20.01.2025**

Sandeep Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Ms. Harshita Kalra, Advocate for
Mr. Ishant Khangwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.188 dated 04.07.2022, under Sections 302, 323, 34, 498-A IPC, registered at Police Station Garhi, District Jind.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is in custody for about 2½ years and the allegations in the FIR were that the wife of the brother of the petitioner had died and allegations were with regard to strangulation by the petitioner and his brother. She further submitted that the brother of the petitioner was married for about 15 years and there was no earlier complaint from the wife of his brother and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and considering the aforesaid custody of the petitioner, he may be considered for grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana has



CRM-M-14937-2024

-2-

referred to the earlier status report dated 22.04.2024 filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Narwana, District Jind and also filed a fresh status report dated 06.11.2024 in pursuance of the orders passed by this Court on 12.09.2024 and submitted that as per the medical opinion given by the doctor of the Department of Forensic Medicine BPS Govt. Medical College for Women Khanpur Kalan (Sonepat), the cause of death in this case is ligature strangulation which is ante mortam in nature. He further submitted that it is a case where the allegations against the petitioner and his brother are that they were suspecting illegal relationship of the deceased and in the present case the petitioner although brother-in-law of the deceased had given her a *danda* blow and thereafter both of them had strangled the deceased and the cause of death is also strangulation. He also submitted that now 4 out of 14 total cited prosecution witnesses have already been examined and the trial of the case is going at good pace and considering the seriousness and gravity of the offence, the petitioner is not entitled for grant of regular bail.

4. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties.

5. It is a case where the petitioner is in custody for about 2 years and 6 months and as per the learned counsels for the parties, 4 out of 14 total cited prosecution witnesses have already been examined. The allegations against the petitioner are that he along with his brother had killed the wife of his brother by way of strangulation. As per the learned State Counsel, the role attributed to the petitioner was not only aiding his brother in strangulation but also giving the deceased a *danda* blow.

6. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties, this Court is of the considered view that considering the gravity and seriousness of the offence, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail. Consequently,



CRM-M-14937-2024

-3-

finding no merit in the present petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

7. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is only meant for the purpose of decision of present petition.

20.01.2025

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

Bhumika

- | | |
|------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable: | Yes/No |