



214
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18507-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.07.2025

Manjeet Singh @ Beet

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present: Mr. Sandeep Saini, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan Singh Rai, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.154 dated 16.10.2024, under Section 108 of BNS, registered at Police Station Pasyana, District Patiala.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is in custody for 8 months and 12 days and the investigation of the case has been completed and thereafter challan has been presented. He submitted that the charges in the present case have been framed but no prosecution witness has been examined till date. He submitted that the wife of the petitioner and his 14 years old daughter were thrown into a canal and although the wife survived but the daughter of the petitioner was found dead. He submitted that although there are a number of allegations contained in the FIR regarding beatings and taking away of gold



ornaments as well as allegations regarding illicit relationship of the petitioner with another girl but no prior complaint was made to the police before lodging of the present FIR. He submitted that considering the custody of the petitioner, he may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan Singh Rai, Sr. DAG, Punjab has opposed the grant of bail on the ground that although the custody of the petitioner is 8 months and 12 days but the allegations against the petitioner were serious in nature and considering the gravity of the offence, the petitioner is not entitled for the grant of regular bail. He submitted that no prosecution witness has been examined in the present case and considering the serious allegations, there is a likelihood that in case the petitioner is released on bail, then he may not only influence the witnesses but he may also abscond from justice. While referring to the allegations, he submitted that it is a case where the marriage between the petitioner and his wife took place in the year 2007 out of which two children were born, one is the boy and the other one is a girl. The son is of the age of 16 years and the daughter is of the age of 14 years and there are direct allegations attributable to the present petitioner regarding the dispute between them where the wife who is the sister of the complainant alleged that the petitioner was having an illicit relationship with another girl and was also beating her and just before the occurrence, the petitioner allegedly visited his wife and threatened to kill her alongwith their children and thereafter, as per the allegations, the petitioner attempted to kill his wife and daughter. He submitted that the wife of the petitioner and his 14 years old daughter were thrown into a canal and although the wife survived but the daughter of the



petitioner unfortunately died. He submitted that considering the aforesaid serious allegations and the gravity of the offence, the petitioner is not entitled for the grant of regular bail particularly in view of the fact that no prosecution witness has been examined till date.

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

5. It is a case where the petitioner is in custody for 8 months and 12 days. The charges are stated to have been framed but no prosecution witness has been examined till date. As per the FIR, the allegations against the petitioner were direct allegations pertaining to not only his alleged illicit relationship with another girl but also for beatings and threatening to kill his own wife. The death of the daughter of the petitioner had taken place due to drowning, as per the learned counsel for the State, although the wife of the petitioner survived. Considering the gravity of the aforesaid allegations against the petitioner and also the apprehension expressed by the learned State counsel and considering the stage of the trial where no prosecution witness has been examined till date, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner does not deserve the concession of regular bail.

6. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

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

09.07.2025

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)

rakesh

JUDGE

Whether speaking	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No