



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

**CRM-M-16514-2025
Reserved on: 21st May, 2025
Pronounced on: 23rd May, 2025**

Harjeet Singh @ Harjit Singh @ Jeeta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The instant one is the third petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 49 dated 03.07.2020 registered under Sections 302, 382, 201 read with Section 34 of IPC at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana. The previous petition as filed by him had been dismissed as withdrawn.

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Mewa Singh, alleging that after death of his wife Paramjit Kaur, he had performed marriage with Balwinder Kaur, who was looking after his three children from first marriage. One daughter



Balvir Kaur @ Cheenu had been born to Balwinder Kaur, who was 23 years old. On 02.07.2020, the complainant along with his wife had gone to some other village while leaving Balvir Kaur alone at home. They reached home at 7:00 PM and found her lying on the floor of a room in an injured condition. Her lower was found removed. Her neck was tied with a *dupatta* and there was a deep wound on the right side of her head. Blood was also oozing from her nose and mouth. She was rushed to hospital but was declared to be brought dead. While alleging that his daughter had been murdered, he prayed for taking action. The aforementioned FIR was registered against unknown persons. Investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. During the course of investigation, CCTV cameras of vicinity were checked and at about 4:50 PM of the relevant day, one male and one female both with muffled faces were seen coming on a motorcycle that was parked outside the house of the complainant. The female was seen coming out of the house of the complainant after sometime and she was having one envelop in her hand. Other CCTV footages showed both of them while going back on the same bike. The bike number was noted and on verifying, it was found that this bike was registered in the name of none else but the complainant himself. The complainant recorded a supplementary statement on 03.07.2020 to the effect that some gold and silver ornaments and two watches kept in the locker of his almirah were found missing. The complainant also disclosed that the motorcycle which was shown in the photographs was in his name but it had been given to his son Jitender Singh by his in-laws at the time of his marriage. On watching the CCTV footage,



he disclosed that he was confident that Charanjit Kaur, wife of his son Jitender Singh along with Harjit Singh, who was residing as a tenant in the same house wherein his son was residing, were the persons, who had a hand in the murder of his daughter. On his statement, the petitioner and co-accused Charanjit Kaur were nominated as such. Offence under Section 328 of IPC was added.

4. As per the further allegations, the petitioner and co-accused Charanjit Kaur were arrested on 03.07.2020. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statements admitted their involvement in the crime and got recovered the motorcycle used at the time of occurrence as well as stolen articles and watches. They also admitted their involvement in the crime. Investigation has since been completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is no eye-witness to the murder of the victim. He had no motive to commit the subject offence. He was not named in the FIR. Even as per the allegations, he was standing outside the house of the victim and had not entered therein at the time of occurrence. As such there was no question of his committing the murder of the victim. A false recovery has been planted upon him. He has clean antecedents. He is in custody since 10.07.2020. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

6. Status report has been filed by respondent-State. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner, who alongwith the co-accused had



committed murder of the victim and also committed theft of gold ornaments from the house of the victim. His complicity in the crime stands established from the material placed on record. It is well established that mere long period of incarceration in jail per se is not material for entitling an accused to be enlarged on bail if the accused has committed a heinous offence. Only six witnesses remain to be examined. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. Rival contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties have been considered.

8. As per the allegations, the petitioner was having illicit relations with the co-accused Charanjit Kaur and in connivance with her, he committed murder of the victim with the help of a *Dupatta*. Recovery of stolen gold ornaments belonging to the complainant has been effected at his instance. Not even this, he along with the co-accused is stated to have suffered an extra judicial confession before PW-3 Lal Singh admitting his involvement in the crime. A copy of sworn deposition of PW-3 Lal Singh has been placed on record, which is in support of the prosecution version. The claim that he had remained outside at the time of occurrence, whereas Charanjit Kaur had gone inside the house of the victim and committed her murder and he had no participation in the same, cannot be accepted at this stage and it is only on thorough assessment and evaluation of the assessment to be produced before the learned trial Court that any definite conclusion can be drawn in this regard. The active connivance of the petitioner is however, reflected from the material placed on record. The allegations against him are



obviously grave in nature. Keeping in view the gravity of the offence, severity of punishment in the event of conviction, the apprehension of petitioner's absconding or fleeing or of influencing the witnesses are important factors, while considering his prayer for grant of bail and on consideration thereof, this Court is of the opinion that no case for grant of bail to the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

23rd May, 2025

Parveen Sharma

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