

2025:PHHC:125938



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

206-1 **CRM-M-61245-2024**
Date of Decision: 12.09.2025

HARMANINDER SINGH ALIAS MANNU ... Petitioner
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... Respondent

206-2 **CRM-M-33909-2025**
JUGRAJ SINGH @ YUVI ... Petitioner
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... Respondent

206-3 **CRM-M-53706-2024**
ARPANBEER SINGH ALIAS ARPAN ... Petitioner
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... Respondent

A N D

206-4 **CRM-M-787-2025**
ARSHDEEP SINGH ALIAS ARSH ... Petitioner
VERSUS
STATE OF PUNJAB ... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Kamal Gupta and Mr. Sanish Girdhar,
Advocates for the petitioner in CRM-M-61245-2024.

Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioners in
CRM-M-33909-2025 and CRM-M-53706-2024.

Ms. Mehak Bedi and Ms. Vaishali Thakur,
Advocates for Mr. Vivek Thakur, Advocate
for petitioner in CRM-M-787-2025.

Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

By virtue of this common order, I shall decide all the
abovementioned petitions, since the same arise out of the same FIR.

2. These petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS for
grant of regular bail to the respective petitioners in case FIR No.0004 dated
14.01.2024 under Sections 302, 34, 120-B of IPC (Section 212 added later on)
registered at Police Station Jhabal, District Tarn Taran.

3. Custody certificates of the petitioners have been filed today in
Court by the learned State Counsel. Same are taken on record.

4. The case of the prosecution is that while the deceased was sitting
in a salon for haircut, two unknown persons came on a motorcycle and one of
them entered the salon and took out pistol and fired four shots at Avan Kumar
@ Sonu, who subsequently succumbed to his injuries during the treatment in
hospital. It was alleged in the FIR that the incident was preplanned with
conspiracy hatched by Amritpal Singh Bath son of Satnam Singh and the said
Amritpal Singh Bath had been threatening to kill Avan Kumar @ Sonu since
long due to previous enmity.

5. Learned Counsel for the petitioner namely Jugraj Singh @ Yuvi submits that the said Amritpal Singh Bath is stated to be a gangster living abroad and has got the deceased murdered through two hitmen, who have neither been arrested nor identified till date. He further submits that a supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded later on, pursuant to which, petitioner Harmaninder Singh was arrested during the course of investigation and on the basis of disclosure statement made by Harmaninder Singh, the co-accused namely Jugraj Singh @ Yuvi was arrested in the present case. He further submits that apart from the disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the said petitioner with the alleged offence. Learned counsel for the remaining petitioners also argued on the similar lines and submitted that apart from disclosure statements, there is no iota of evidence to connect the petitioners with the offence in question.

6. Learned counsel for the respective petitioners further submit that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the case in hand merely on the basis of a disclosure statement and even the mandatory provisions have not been complied with. He further submits that the petitioners are innocent and apart from the statement of the complainant or the disclosure statements of the accused, no other evidence has been collected by the prosecution. They further submit that the speedy trial of the case is a valuable right of an accused, whereas the trial Court has examined only 14 witnesses till date out of the 31 cited witnesses. The trial may take some long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by detaining the petitioners behind bars any longer,

since they have already undergone custody of more than one and have year each. They thus pray that the petitioners be granted concession of regular bail.

7. Mr. Rishabh Singla, AAG, Punjab has filed the custody certificates in the Court today, which are taken on record. As per custody certificates, the petitioner Harmaninder Singh @ Manu has undergone custody for a period of 01 year, 05 months and 08 days as an undertrial prisoner; petitioner Jugraj Singh @ Yuvi has undergone custody of 01 year, 07 months and 06 days; the petitioner Arpanbir Singh has undergone custody for a period of 01 year, 07 months and 10 days and the petitioner namely Arshdeep Singh @ Arsh has undergone custody for a period of 01 year, 07 months and 10 days respectively. Learned State Counsel vehemently opposed the petitions on the ground that the petitioners have played an active role in the commission of offence and there is strong chain of evidence against all of them. The trial of the case is still going on and releasing the petitioners on bail may cause unnecessary delay in concluding the trial. Apart from that, there is every apprehension that the petitioner may influence or induce the prosecution witnesses. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petitions.

8. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

9. On the asking of Court, learned State Counsel could not dispute that the prosecution has examined only 14 witnesses out of total 31 witnesses. It is also not in dispute that the petitioners have been arrested in this case only on the basis statement of complainant or the disclosure statements of co-accused

persons. More so, the persons who had executed the murder of Avan Kumar @ Sonu have not yet been arrested or identified till date and the alleged mastermind of the conspiracy namely Amritpal Singh Bath is also out of the reach of police department. The trial may take long time to conclude and in that case, the right of speedy trial of the petitioner shall stand infringed. In these circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioners behind bars any longer, especially when they have already undergone a substantial of custody as undertrial prisoners.

10. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that there despite a custody of more than one year and a half year, the prosecution is not able to exhaust the entire list of prosecution, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners deserve concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous detention of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners during the pendency of the trial.

11. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, instant petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

12 It is clarified that if while on bail, so granted through the instant order, the petitioners are found indulging in any other criminal case, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of their bail.

- 13. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.
- 14. Photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

SEPT. 12, 2025.

Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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