



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

206

CRM-M-24912-2025
Date of decision:05.12.2025

SATPAL

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Karan Bhardwaj, Advocate with
Mr. Pardeep Kumar, Advocate and
Mr. Ishaan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 100 dated 18.07.2023, registered under Section(s) 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sri Hargobindpur, District Batala.

2. Briefly summarised, the facts of the present case are that the FIR was registered on the statement of Rashpal Ram, who stated that he is a labourer by occupation and that he and his four brothers live separately. His father had passed away and his mother, Jasbir Kaur, was residing with her brother Satpal. The complainant alleged that on 17.07.2023 at about 07:00 PM, he learnt that Satpal had mercilessly beaten his mother. When he reached there, he noticed blood oozing from her right hand. Upon being questioned, his mother disclosed that Satpal had beaten her and had forcibly demanded

money from her. When she expressed her inability to give money, Satpal assaulted her with a stick, causing injuries on her left shoulder and both arms and even attempted to inflict a knife blow on her stomach. The complainant arranged a vehicle to take her to the hospital; however, his mother succumbed to her injuries before medical help could be reached.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has remained in custody since 19.07.2023, having thus undergone an actual custody of more than 02 years and 04 months. It is submitted that the present case rests entirely on circumstantial evidence and is founded on the statement of the complainant Rashpal Singh, who is none other than the brother of the petitioner. Counsel further submits that the two principal witnesses of the prosecution i.e. Rashpal Singh (PW-1) and his wife Puja (PW-2) have not supported the case of the prosecution. It is further contended that although the injuries have been alleged to have been inflicted with a knife, no knife has been recovered during the investigation, rather, only a sota has been recovered, which bears no nexus to the injuries noted on the body of the deceased. Counsel submits that the consistent stand of the petitioner is that their mother slipped from the stairs and suffered injuries, including bruises, which ultimately proved fatal. It is argued that there was no occasion or motive for the petitioner to assault his mother and the initial assertion made by the complainant was based on a misunderstanding. He further contends that only 02 witnesses out of total of 15 witnesses cited by the prosecution have been examined so far and as such the conclusion of the trial shall take long.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the period of custody undergone by the petitioner and also the fact that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude.

5. I have heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties.

6. In view of the facts noticed above and upon considering the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner, including the period of actual custody already undergone being more than 02 years and 04 months, his clean antecedents, the testimony of the material witnesses who have already appeared before the Trial Court, the circumstances surrounding the occurrence and the present stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

7. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

DECEMBER 05, 2025

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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