



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

CRM-M-22191-2025

Date of Decision: 21.11.2025

VARINDER SINGH

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Vikas Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal AAG, Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This is the second application under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.133, dated 12.06.2022, registered at Police Station Chheharta, District Amritsar, under Sections 302, 379-B, 34, 120-B, 380 and 177 of IPC, 1860.

2. In compliance of order dated 20.08.2025 passed by this Court, status report by way of an affidavit dated 18.09.2025 of Shivdarshan Singh, PPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, West Amritsar City, filed in the Registry on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tat the same at an appropriate place.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police during



investigation has been perused.

4. The present case was registered on the statement given to the police by Satnam Kaur (who has been subsequently arrayed as an accused) with the allegations that she was married with the Harinder Singh in the year 2013 and two children were born out of the wedlock. Her husband used to work in Dubai for the past 12-13 years and had come to India for the last 12-13 days. On 12.06.2022 at about 3.30 am, she alongwith her husband and two daughters was going to pay obeisance at Sri Darbar Sahib on their motorcycle, and when they reached Harkrishna Nagar near Dashmesh Gun House, Kale Road, two unknown persons came on a motorcycle from behind and pushed them as a result of which they fell down. One of those persons fired a shot at the head of her husband and also took away the mobile phone of her husband as well as her own mobile phone. She cried for help on which public gathered at the spot and after sometime, her father-in-law Harbhajan Singh and other family members came to the spot. They arranged a vehicle and took her husband to the hospital where he was declared dead. The matter was investigated.

5. During investigation, a secret information was received by the Station House Officer (SHO), Police Station Chheharta, Amritsar to the effect that Satnam Kaur-complainant in connivance with Varinder Singh-petitioner and Arshdeep Singh had got her husband killed as Satnam Kaur had developed illicit relations with the said Arshdeep Singh while her husband was away to the Dubai. Deceased suspected about their relationship and had returned from Dubai and was keeping an eye upon his wife and as such, he had become a hurdle in the illicit relations



between Satnam Kaur and Arshdeep Singh. Thereafter, Satnam Kaur and Arshdeep Singh hatched a conspiracy and hired petitioner-Virender Singh to commit the murder of her husband and paid him Rs.2,70,000/-. Arshdeep Singh had stolen the licensed pistol of his uncle Lal Singh and gave it to petitioner-Virender Singh and thereafter, Virender Singh and Arshdeep Singh committed the murder. The petitioner and Arshdeep Singh were arrested on 12.06.2022 and during personal search of Arshdeep Singh, weapon of offence i.e. 1.32 bore pistol alongwith 5 cartridges were recovered alongwith one mobile phone and one mobile phone was also recovered from petitioner. On interrogation, co-accused Arshdeep Singh suffered disclosure statement admitting having illicit relations with Satnam Kaur and having committed the murder in conspiracy with the petitioner by paying him Rs.2,70,000/-. On 11.06.2022, Satnam Kaur had told him that they will be going to Golden Temple to pay obeisance on 12.06.2022 in early hours and thereafter, they kept an eye on the movement of Satnam Kaur and deceased Harinder Singh and had chased them on their motorcycle and committed the murder. Petitioner-Varinder Singh also suffered disclosure statement to the same effect and further stated that he had returned the motorcycle and pistol to Arshdeep Singh after committing the murder. Thereafter, the statement of father of the deceased was also recorded in which he stated that his daughter-in-law had developed illicit relations with Arshdeep Singh and he had seen both of them together and when she was confronted, she had apologized to them and promised not to indulge in such kind of acts in future and they had kept silent due to family honour. Thereafter, Satnam Kaur was also arrested on 12.06.2022 and she also



admitted having committed the offence in question. Thereafter, in pursuance of his disclosure statement, accused Arshdeep Singh got recovered one mobile phone of co-accused Satnam Kaur which was given to him by the petitioner which had been taken away at the time of incident. Thereafter, accused himself got recovered a Samsung mobile phone of deceased without any SIM card alongwith his wallet containing his driving license issued by UAE, one citizenship card of the deceased issued by UAE and 300 UAE Dharams from his house. After completion of investigation, final report has been presented in the Court for trial.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The offence, in question, was committed by unknown persons and a false story has been concocted later on by roping in the wife of the deceased as well as petitioner and Arshdeep Singh as the accused. The petitioner has been nominated as an accused on the basis of secret information and subsequently, from the disclosure statement of co-accused Arshdeep Singh which is not admissible in evidence. False recovery of the mobile phone and documents of the deceased has been fastened upon the petitioner. The disclosure statement of co-accused as well as his own disclosure statement are not admissible in evidence. Petitioner is in custody since 12.06.2022. Co-accused namely Satnam Kaur has been released on bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 01.02.2024 (Annexure P-3). Even the weapon of offence has been recovered from the possession of Arshdeep Singh and not from the petitioner. The trial is likely to take sufficiently long time to conclude, and in these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and he



deserves to be released on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and after committing the murder, he had returned the licensed pistol of uncle of Arshdeep Singh to said Arshdeep Singh. The mobile phone of deceased alongwith his wallet containing his driving license issued by UAE, one citizenship card of the deceased issued by UAE and 300 UAE Dhiraams having been recovered from his house in pursuance of his disclosure statement which proves his complicity in committing the crime and petitioner does not deserve concession of bail.

7. No one has been named as an accused in the said FIR. The FIR was lodged by Satnam Kaur who was subsequently impleaded as an accused with the allegations that she was having illicit relations with co-accused Arshdeep Singh and since her husband had come to know of their relationship, they hatched the conspiracy alongwith present petitioner to eliminate him. The weapon of offence too has been recovered from the possession of co-accused Arshdeep Singh who was allegedly having illicit relations with co-accused Satnam Kaur. As to whether petitioner retained the mobile phone and wallet of the deceased shall be subject matter of trial and possibility of the same having been planted cannot be ruled out as no one will retain a mobile phone and documents with him, after committing the murder, so as to create evidence against him. Co-accused namely Satnam Kaur has been released on bail by a Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 01.02.2024 (Annexure P-3). Petitioner is in custody since 12.06.2022. Only 3 witnesses out of 28 witnesses cited by the prosecution have been

examined till date and trial will, thus, take a long time to conclude. It is well settled that bail is the rule and jail is an exception and pre-trial incarceration cannot be used as a tool to punish an offender. The petitioner, thus, deserves to be released on bail.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

21.11.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No