



219

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

**CRM-M No.7633 of 2026
Date of Decision: 05.05.2026**

Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukhi

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Ms. Pooja Dhingra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Dhiraj Jindal, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.113, dated 17.09.2024, under Sections 103(1) and 61(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Nathana, District Bathinda.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Sukhmander Singh. It was alleged that on 17.09.2024, at about 07:30 P.M., the complainant went to the house of his brother, namely, Parminder Singh @ Pindi (deceased) for switching off motor of his fields. The complainant heard the noise that his sister-in-law, namely, Jasvir Kaur talking to her

son, namely, Sukhdeep Singh, i.e. the petitioner to run away by saying that what was destined had happened. The complainant went inside and saw that his brother, namely, Parminder Singh @ Pindi (deceased) was lying in a dead condition on the bed and blood was oozing from his head and throat. The injuries were apparently visible being inflicted with sharp edged weapons. The complainant got perplexed and went to his home, thereafter, he told about the same to his son, namely, Jagdeep Singh, who telephonically informed the police. It appears that Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukhi, i.e. the petitioner and his mother, namely, Jasvir Kaur in connivance with each other had murdered his bother. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against both the accused. On the basis of the same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 17.09.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented and on framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda praying for the grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 19.01.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. She has submitted that admittedly the case of the prosecution is totally based on the circumstantial evidences. She has submitted that the petitioner has been roped in the present case wherein he has been alleged

to have murdered his own father. She has submitted that not only the petitioner, his mother has also been implicated in the present case. She has submitted that the complainant, who is none other than the brother of the deceased, has lodged the FIR projecting himself as the eye-witness. She has submitted that the petitioner along with his parents used to live in Dhani, which is in open place and the murder of his father has been committed by some unknown persons whereas the petitioner along with his mother has been implicated. She has submitted that except the recovery of the dead body, there is no credible evidence collected by the prosecution against the petitioner. She has submitted that once the case is based on the circumstantial evidences, the prosecution is bound to prove the complete chain of evidences, however, except the presumptions and assumptions, there is nothing on the record against the petitioner. To buttress her arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. She has submitted that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 17.09.2024, however, there is no material progress in the trial. She has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner has killed his own father. He has submitted that the complainant is the eye-witness, who has seen him running from the place of occurrence. He has thus submitted that no case for the grant of bail to the petitioner is made out and the present petition deserves to be



dismissed.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has also vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the dead body was recovered from the house itself, where the petitioner along with his mother is residing. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of total 18 prosecution witnesses, 15 witnesses still remain to be examined. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court, which is taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that case of the prosecution is based on the circumstantial evidences. The evidence against the petitioner, as contended before this Court, is the recovery of dead body from the house where the petitioner along with his mother is residing. The petitioner as well as his mother, both were the accused in the present case. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 07 months and 15 days as on 05.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. 15 witnesses still remain to be examined out of total 18 prosecution witnesses.

8. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of



regular bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

10. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the cases.

05.05.2026

rittu

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No