



CRM-M-8641-2026

1

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

202

CRM-M-8641-2026

Date of decision: 09.03.2026

GURSEWAK SINGH

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Kamal Narula, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Divyansh Vats, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.154 dated 24.10.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 108 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, Police Station Mamdot, District Ferozepur.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Balaka Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was alleged by the complainant that the marriage of his son 'Sukhbir Singh' was solemnized about 7-8 months ago with 'Virpal Kaur', and that after some time of marriage, their relationship became sour, as 'Virpal Kaur' used to fight with his son very frequently over trivial matters, and used to share every details with her parents and relatives,.



According to complainant, due to above-mentioned behaviour of his daughter-in-law, his son 'Sukhbir Singh' was very upset. It was further stated by the complainant that in the previous month, his son was visiting home on one month's leave, and during that period, he remained very upset.

3. It was further stated by the complainant that two days before Diwali, Gursewak Singh, brother-in-law of his son, visited their home and spoke in a very insulting manner and threatened that he would file the FIR and implicate the complainant and his son 'Sukhbir Singh' in the case for cruelty for the demand of dowry. As per complainant, Gursewak Singh also threatened 'Sukhbir Singh' that he would get him suspended. According to complainant, in the backdrop of above-mentioned developments his son, who was very upset, left home on 21.10.2025 at 06:00 PM, and later on, his dead body was recovered from the canal. It was also stated by the complainant that in the phone of his deceased son, there was a video clip, wherein the suicide message was recorded.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above-mentioned information, formal FIR of this case lodged and the investigation taken up.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that petitioner is innocent, who has been falsely implicated in the present case. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner has already suffered a prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than four months. According to learned counsel for the petitioner nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner, and therefore, his detention is not likely to serve any purpose.



7. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that in the present case the entire prosecution case is based upon the assertion that the deceased/victim, before committing suicide, had recorded a video clip, wherein he implicated the petitioner. With regard to above-mentioned video footage, it has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that firstly, the video footage was not just before the commission of suicide and secondly, no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner in the commission of crime. While claiming that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future and that detention of petitioner in lock-up will not serve any purpose, the learned counsel for the petitioner has sought for the benefit of bail for the petitioner.

8. The learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. According to learned State counsel in the present case the suicide was committed by a uniformed soldier serving the Indian Army, who found himself in such a tight corner that despite being a soldier, he could not face the harassment, to which he was subjected to, being committed suicide, while on long leave. As per learned State counsel, such situation cropped up in less than one year of his marital life. In view of above, the learned State counsel has contended that the fact situation of the present case speaks in volumes about the conduct of the petitioner, his mother and sister.

9. In addition to above, the learned State counsel has also contended that in the present case another relevant aspect to be taken into consideration is that the family of petitioner has scant respect for the rule of law, which is reflected from the fact that the mother of the petitioner, who could not secure



anticipatory bail in this Court, is still at large. It has also been contended by learned State counsel that even the sister of petitioner is absconding. In view of above, the learned State counsel has contended that the investigation in the present case is still pending qua co-accused, and therefore, real facts are yet to crystallize.

10. The record has been perused carefully.

11. As far as the instant case is concerned at the very out-set, it is pertinent to mention here that this fact cannot be ignored that a disciplined soldier serving Indian Army has been forced to commit suicide. There is a video footage recorded by the deceased himself, wherein he has specifically levelled allegations against the petitioner and members of his in-laws family. At this stage, the other family members of the petitioner, i.e. mother and sister of petitioner, are still at large and qua them the investigation is yet to be concluded.

12. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above-mentioned factors, it is hereby held that at this stage, no ground for grant of bail to the petitioner is made out. Thus, it is hereby held that the present petition is devoid of merits and deserves dismissal. The same is hereby dismissed accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

09.03.2026

vipin

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