



CRM-M-60081-2024

-1-

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

315

CRM-M-60081-2024

Date of decision: 10th July, 2025

Parminder Singh @ Bai

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Dhruv Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.
Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Arora, Advocate for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 203 dated 24.10.2023 registered under Sections 302, 307 and 324 of IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sadar Khanna, Ludhiana.

2. As per the allegations, the complainant Jang Singh was running a Dhaba at village Libra under the name of Kirat Vaishno Dhaba. On the night of 23.10.2023, he along with his mother Baljeet Kaur had gone towards the Dhaba. On reaching there, he found the lights of the Dhaba to be closed. As they proceeded further, they found the petitioner, who is his brother while standing there with a knife. Immediately on seeing the complainant and his mother, the petitioner opened an attack by stabbing his mother with the knife with an intent to kill her. He struck blows with knife on the left side of her abdomen. The complainant rushed for her rescue but



he too sustained injuries at the hands of the petitioner and fingers of his left hand were injured. The knife had fallen from the hand of the petitioner. The complainant rushed his mother to hospital. On his statement, initially a case under Section 324 and 302 of IPC read with Section 25 of Arms Act was registered. The mother of the complainant succumbed to her injuries. Offence under Section 302 of IPC was added. Post-mortem examination of the dead body and inquest proceedings were conducted. The petitioner was arrested and has been in custody since 02.11.2023. Presently, he is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. Infact, civil litigation was pending against the complainant and himself and on the day of incident itself, a stay order qua elimination of the property, which was in dispute between them, had been passed in favour of the petitioner. The complainant was agitated over this fact as he wanted to sell the property. False allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. The complainant has influenced the witnesses also to grab the property of the petitioner. The complainant and other material witnesses have been examined. There are no chances of his intimidating the witnesses or absconding. He has clean antecedents. Trial will take sufficient time to conclude. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. Therefore, it is, urged that he deserves to be extended benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. Status report has been filed. It is argued by learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who had



not only killed his own mother by striking blows with a knife, but had also caused injuries to the complainant, who is his brother. The complainant had sustained four injuries caused by sharp edged weapon. There is sufficient material on record to connect him with the crime. Allegations against him are grave in nature. There are chances of his absconding or intimidating the witnesses, if extended benefit of bail. Therefore, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

6. The petitioner is alleged to have committed the murder of his mother and is also alleged to have caused injuries to his brother i.e. the complainant on the night of 23.10.2023. The allegations against him are grave in nature. The complainant and some material witnesses have since been examined and are stated to have supported the prosecution version. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, I am of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Hence, the same is dismissed.

7. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

10th July, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No