



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-45204-2025

Date of Decision: 29.11.2025

KULDEEP SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sarabjit Singh Grewal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh A.A.G. Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant second petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking the relief of regular bail in a case arising out of FIR No.0001 dated 07.01.2023, registered under Sections 302 and 34 of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Bhadson, District Patiala, on the basis of a statement recorded by the complainant–Resham Singh on 07.01.2023, alleging that his brother Jasveer Singh had gone missing on 02.01.2023 and could not be traced. A missing report was lodged on 04.01.2023. He raised suspicion that his brother’s wife, Prabhjot Kaur, who was allegedly having an illicit relationship with the present petitioner, had killed his brother and disposed of the dead body. Investigation was initiated, and the dead body of the victim was recovered from Narwana Canal.
2. The petitioner and the co-accused were arrested on 09.01.2023. The petitioner is stated to have admitted his involvement in the crime. Presently, both are facing trial for the offence of murder.
3. The previous petition filed by the petitioner, bearing CRM-M-



7473-2025, was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 09.04.2025, wherein the following observations were made:

6. *The petitioner in connivance with and with the aid of the co-accused is alleged to have committed the murder of the victim. Weapon of offence was recovered at his instance. It is submitted by learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab that as per the chemical examination report, finger prints lifted from the liquor bottle that was recovered from the spot of occurrence have matched with that of the petitioner. His case cannot be stated to be at parity with the case of co-accused Prabhjot Kaur. The mere fact that the petitioner has undergone certain period of incarceration by itself would not entitle the accused to be enlarged on bail, nor the fact that the trial is not likely to be completed in near future is sufficient for enlarging the petitioner on bail as gravity of offence alleged is severe. Keeping in view the above discussed facts but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case lest the same prejudices the trial in any manner, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail. Hence, the petition is dismissed.*

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is no eye-witness to the alleged murder. The case is based on circumstantial evidence and no circumstance conclusively connects the petitioner with the crime. It is further submitted that the co-accused Prabhjot Kaur has already been granted bail.

5. It is further argued that the trial is likely to take considerable time to conclude and that, since the dismissal of the previous petition, a



substantial period has passed; therefore, continued detention of the petitioner would serve no useful purpose.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has argued that no ground for grant of bail is made out, as the earlier petition was dismissed after detailed consideration of the gravity of the allegations. It is contended that the present petition also deserves to be dismissed.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner, in furtherance of his common intention with the co-accused, is alleged to have committed the murder of the victim. Not only was the weapon of offence recovered at his instance, but his fingerprints were also found on the liquor bottle recovered from the place of occurrence. These circumstances *prima facie* indicate the petitioner’s involvement. The co-accused was granted bail vide order dated 24.07.2024, and this aspect was duly considered while dismissing the previous petition of the petitioner. Thus, no new or substantial ground has been raised in the present petition to justify reconsideration. Mere prolonged incarceration in a case involving a serious offence such as murder cannot, by itself, be a ground for grant of bail.

9. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations, the gravity of the offence, the possible sentence upon conviction, and the attending circumstances, this Court finds no reason to allow the petition. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

November 29, 2025
Nisha-1

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