



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

CRM-M No.20361 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25th April, 2025

Satnam Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Raj Partap S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner is seeking the concession of regular bail under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. in case bearing FIR No.235 dated 06.12.2020 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 302, 201 of IPC and sections 27, 54, 59 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been in custody since 06.12.2020 in a case of false implication wherein he has been accused of committing the murder of his own wife and son. It is contended that the very premise of such allegations is highly improbable and unnatural, particularly when the purported motive is rooted in a dispute over family property. It is argued

that it is inconceivable that a father would resort to such an extreme act merely over property distribution.

3. Learned counsel further contends that the case of the prosecution is primarily based on alleged eye-witness account, particularly the mother of the petitioner, who, having been cited as an eye-witness, did not support the case of the prosecution when she stepped into the witness box. Consequently, she was declared hostile, which, as per the learned counsel for the petitioner, undermines the credibility of the case of the prosecution and strengthens the argument of false implication.

4. It is further submitted that the complainant, who is the daughter-in-law of the petitioner, did not witness the actual occurrence of the double murder, as she herself stated during her cross-examination that she was in another room at the relevant time when she heard the noise of firing. Thus, the primary witnesses having either turned hostile or not being eye-witnesses to the murders, it is urged that the petitioner be granted the concession of bail, particularly as the substantive evidence has already been recorded.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, and has drawn the attention of this Court to the gravity and brutal nature of the offense alleged against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR, annexed as Annexure P-1, which contains a vivid and detailed account by the complainant, daughter-in-law of the

petitioner of the incident in which the petitioner allegedly murdered his own wife and younger son in broad daylight and in full view of the family members.

6. It has been further submitted that the statement of the complainant recorded on the day of the incident itself, narrates that the petitioner entered the house armed with a 12 bore licensed double barreled gun and without any provocation, shot his younger son Amarjang Singh alias Babu in the head, resulting in instantaneous death. When his wife Rupinder Kaur, tried to intervene, the petitioner shot her as well, causing fatal injuries. Furthermore, it has been asserted by the learned State counsel that the motive for the crime stemmed from a land dispute after the father of the petitioner had divided the ancestral land in favour of his grandsons, bypassing the petitioner due to his addiction to alcohol and irresponsible conduct.

7. It is further contended, on instructions, that the complainant, while testifying before the learned trial Court, has fully supported the case of the prosecution and reiterated the material allegations against the petitioner, including the mode and manner in which the murders were committed. It is also submitted that in case the mother of the petitioner did not support the case of the prosecution and was declared hostile, it was for reasons but obvious.

8. Learned State counsel has further submitted that the trial is at an advanced stage with only 11 formal witnesses yet to be examined.

Given the serious and heinous nature of the allegations, a prayer has been made for dismissal of the instant petition.

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

10. The petitioner is facing trial in a case involving the double murder of his own wife and son. The allegations against him are grave, specific, and backed by eye-witness account. Allegedly, the petitioner, armed with a licensed firearm, entered the family residence and in a brutal and unprovoked attack, first shot his younger son in the head and thereafter fired at his wife, who attempted to intervene. The incident was witnessed by the complainant, who is none other than the petitioner's daughter-in-law, and her version forms the basis of the FIR (Annexure P-1). It is further borne out from the record that the complainant has reiterated her account before the trial Court and supported the prosecution in all material particulars, thereby prima facie lending credibility to the case of the prosecution.

11. Furthermore, as per instructions received by the learning State counsel, the trial is at an advanced stage. Only formal witnesses remain to be examined, and there is every likelihood that the trial will conclude in the near future.

12. Given the nature of the offence, the specific role attributed to the petitioner, and the advanced stage of the trial, this Court finds no ground to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner at this stage. The petition stands dismissed. 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.

13. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

April 25, 2025

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No