



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

CRM-M-21490-2025

Reserved on: 27th August, 2025

Pronounced on: 3rd September, 2025

Maninderpal Singh @ Monty

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. C.B. Bakshi, Advocate and
Ms. Mallika, Advocate and
Mr. Arjun Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. H.S. Sahi, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J :-

The present petition has been 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. 30 dated 12.03.2025 registered under Sections 105 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Phase 11, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant Basuki Nath Sonar on 12.03.2025 alleging that on the previous night, his son Abhishek Swarnkar had an altercation with the present petitioner on the issue of parking motorcycle. The petitioner assaulted his son and killed him. The mother of the petitioner Jassi @ Prakash had also connived with him. He further alleged that from the past one week, the petitioner had been extending threats of life to him and his son. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Post-mortem examination of the dead body was conducted. A pen



drive containing CCTV footage of the incident that has been handed over by the complainant to the police, was also seen, and it was found that the petitioner had deliberately and forcefully pushed the deceased, during a scuffle arising out of a parking dispute, thereby making the deceased fall on the ground, sustain a fatal head injury resulting into his death. The petitioner was arrested on 15.03.2025. Investigation now stands concluded and he is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. The cause of death of the victim, as mentioned in the PMR, does not correspond to the seat of the injury sustained by the victim, thereby showing that the petitioner was not responsible for causing his death. The only role attributed to him is that he had pushed the deceased. He was admittedly empty-handed at that time. The allegations do not make out a case for commission of offence of culpable homicide, not amounting to murder. Neither any act with intention to cause death of the victim is alleged to have been committed by him, nor any knowledge that the death of the victim could be caused has been attributed. He is in custody since long. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. He does not have any criminal antecedents. His further incarceration will not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that the petitioner was the aggressor, who had a scuffle with the victim and had pushed him on the ground forcefully with intention to cause his death and while having knowledge that the death of the victim could be caused. The victim had



sustained a fatal head injury. The pen drive containing CCTV footage of the incident clearly shows this fact. The cause of death is intracranial hematoma as a result of brain injury. The allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature as the life of an innocent and young person was lost due to his act. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and has gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have assaulted the victim thereby making him fall on the road. The victim had sustained a head injury which resulted in his death. The incident had been captured in a CCTV camera and the petitioner has also not denied this fact. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The trial has commenced and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any unusual delay in conclusion of the same. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as leveled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits of the case lest they prejudice the trial, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

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

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

3rd September, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned

: *Yes / No*

2. Whether reportable

: *Yes / No*