



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-57278-2024
Date of Decision: 28.04.2025

JAGVEER SINGHPetitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Ashok Kumar Khunger, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant 2nd petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jagveer Singh	0138	24.07.2022	302, 452, 427 IPC	Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib	Sri Muktsar Sahib

2. As per version given in the FIR, on the basis of information given by Gurjeet Kaur (daughter-in-law of deceased Pyar Kaur) to her husband Sukhwant Singh, he went ahead to get the FIR lodged in regard to the murder of his mother Pyar Kaur. Only on the basis of doubt, FIR has been registered against the petitioner – Jagveer Singh, who is also related

**CRM-M-57278-2024**

2

as son-in-law of deceased Pyar Kaur as daughter of the deceased was married to the present petitioner.

By referring to G.D. No.16 dated 31.12.2022 (Annexure P-1), counsel submits that after registration of the FIR, the facts were examined and at first instance petitioner was declared innocent. He also submits that one of the star witness namely Gurjeet Kaur (complainant's wife) appeared and resiled from her version. Neither there is any eye-witness nor there is any recovery of weapon etc, directly connecting with the incident of murder.

Counsel further submits that petitioner is inside jail since 17.04.2023 and a period of more than 02 years has already expired and trial is still in progress. Out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only 02 prosecution witnesses have been examined and two have been given up. It appears that culmination of trial would take a sufficient time, thus, prays for grant of bail.

3. On the other hand while opposing the prayer for bail, learned State counsel produces custody certificate and confirms that till date petitioner has suffered incarceration for a period of more than 02 years and that out of total 24 prosecution witnesses, only two prosecution witnesses have been examined and two have been given up. He could not point out any admissible evidence connecting the petitioner directly with the incident. Therefore, prayer for bail seems to be worth considerable.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the record with their able assistance.

**CRM-M-57278-2024**

3

5. In view of totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

April 28, 2025
Sangeeta

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No