



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

228

CRM-M-48138-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 19.08.2025

PRINCE KUMAR ALIAS GITKU

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present:- Ms. R.K. Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Code of Criminal Procedure seeking regular bail in FIR No.182 dated 26.10.2023 under Sections 454, 380, 307 (later of Section 302 IPC was added) registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala, Punjab.

2. The case of the prosecution is that a blind murder had taken place of one Gurpreet Kaur passed away in Rajindra Hospital, Patiala on account of injuries received by her. None was named in the FIR, however, on 29.10.2023 one Happy Mehra recorded in his statement with the police that he had seen the petitioner coming from the place of occurrence. On the basis of that evidence, the petitioner has been involved in the present case. It is alleged by the prosecution that the petitioner alongwith his co-accused entered into the house of an old lady who was residing all alone committed murder by causing injuries on her person with the help of a knife and other weapons and also committed robbery in her house. However, no recovery has been effected from the



petitioner. Also, the petitioner is not seen in the footage of CCTV camera installed in the vicinity.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further states that the petitioner has undergone a custody period of 01 year, 09 months and 13 days and out of 28 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far. He further states that the petitioner is not involved in any other case.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Learned counsel for the State by way of filing of custody certificate, vehemently opposes the grant of concession of regular bail and does not refute the fact that the petitioner has undergone a custody period of 01 year, 09 months and 13 days and out of 28 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined so far.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the material placed on record.

8. Keeping in view the above and that the custody period undergone by the petitioner is 01 year, 09 months and 13 days; out of 28 cited prosecution witnesses, only 02 have been examined, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, further incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Hence, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is granted concession of regular bail in the present case, on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of



the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/ Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. It is however, made clear that in case during his bail, if the petitioner indulges in any offence, the State shall be at liberty to file an application for cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

19th August, 2025

Sonia Puri

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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