



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

225

CRM-M-52085-2024

Date of decision: 30.07.2025

Nirmaljit Singh @ Billa

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS, 2023 in case FIR No.153 dated 22.07.2023, under Sections 304, 34 IPC registered at P.S. Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that deceased namely Jagjit Singh has died on account of drug overdose who was last seen in the company of the present petitioner and co-accused. It is stated that the drug was administered/injected by the present petitioner into the body of the deceased.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as the FSL report (Annexure P-3) reveals that no drug was found in the syringe which was recovered from the spot. Moreover, the cause of death has been determined to be coronary artery disease. The petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 27 days as under trial and out of 12 witnesses, only 1 has been examined, therefore, the petitioner be released on bail pending trial.

4. Notice of motion.



5. Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed custody certificate of the petitioner in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 11 months and 27 days.
6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that *challan* has been presented and out of 12 prosecution witnesses, only 1 has been examined, the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial.
8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.
9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

30.07.2025
anil

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