



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

CRM-M No.53735 of 2024
Date of decision: 27th January, 2025

Gurshinderjit Singh @ Gurshinder Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Sultan S. Gill, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Rana, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioner has approached this Court for the second time, seeking the concession of regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS in case FIR No.145 dated 09.12.2018 under Sections 302, 201, 120-B of the IPC and Sections 25, 27, 30 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Dera Baba Nanak, District Gurdaspur. Previously also, he had filed a similar petition, which was dismissed by this Court vide a detailed order dated 24.04.2024, annexed as Annexure P-5.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioner was asked to show any material change in circumstances warranting consideration of the present petition, given that the earlier one was dismissed on merits. However, the learned counsel was unable to point out any significant change, except for an alleged inordinate delay in the conclusion of the

trial, the petitioner's claim of false implication, and the fact that a key prosecution witness (the complainant), who had initially spelt out the motive behind the crime in question, had resiled during the trial.

3. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, strongly opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, arguing that there was no material change in circumstances. The learned State counsel further submitted, on instructions, that Balwinder Singh, a key witness and a neighbour of both the petitioner and the deceased, had categorically stated to hearing gun-shots on the day of the incident. However, the petitioner had been intimidating this witness with threats of dire consequences, leading to the registration of an FIR against him.

4. Learned State counsel, while drawing the attention of this Court to the FIR in question, highlighted the seriousness of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, which include the petitioner subjecting his deceased wife to physical and mental abuse due to his illicit relationship with another woman. Learned State counsel has further contended that the petitioner fatally shot his wife inside his house and then hastily attempted to cremate her. When the complainant party intervened at the cremation ground, the petitioner along with others, poured kerosene on the pyre and set it ablaze in an effort to conceal evidence.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. Prima facie the allegations against the petitioner are serious and grave, including charges of fatally shooting his wife and attempting to destroy evidence. The earlier petition for bail was dismissed on merits vide a detailed order. No material change in circumstances has been brought to the notice of this Court to justify reconsideration of the petitioner’s prayer for bail. The petition as such stands dismissed. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. However, in light of the prolonged incarceration of the petitioner since 31.09.2023, the trial Court is directed to make earnest efforts to expedite the trial and conclude the proceedings at the earliest.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

January 27, 2025
rps

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