



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

(224)

**CRM-M-9330-2026
DATE OF DECISION:16.04.2026**

Ranjit Singh

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Mukesh Kumar Bhatnagar, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioner is seeking regular bail in FIR No.71 dated 18.06.2014, under Sections 306 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Ramdas, District Amritsar Rural.
2. Brief facts of the case are that the deceased Satnam Singh had committed suicide on 18.06.2014, by hanging himself from the ceiling of his residential house, leaving a suicide note in the pocket of his wearing 'pajama'. The said note was written in his own handwriting stating that he had been extremely harassed by his father-in-law Amrik Singh, Nishan Singh, Ranjit Singh (present petitioner), Hardeep Singh, his wife Mandeep and his mother-in-law Surjit Kaur. On 07.06.2014, all of them came to his house and raised lalkaras and gave life threats to him.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that four co-accused whose case is on same footings to that of the present petitioner have been granted concession of anticipatory bail by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, vide its orders dated 12.11.2025 and 20.11.2025 (Annexures P-3 and P-4), that the petitioner is in custody for the last six



months and investigation qua him has already been completed and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him behind the bar. He further submitted that even if the suicide note is taken into the consideration, the allegations of harassment so levelled against the petitioner does not particularly points out as to what sough of the harassment was faced by the deceased Satnam Singh and nor he particularly referred the alleged role as played by the petitioner, which instigated him to commit suicide. The present FIR just came into the existence so as to implicate the whole of the family of the said Mandeep Kaur into a case where the death of the deceased has been caused due to his own stressful life. That the petitioner has been wrongly nominated as an accused in the present FIR. In fact, the essential ingredients of Section 306 IPC are not made out in the present case as till date no evidence has come on record to *prima facie* establish as to how the petitioner is liable for the abetment of suicide of Satnam Singh. In support of his contentions, learned counsel has relied upon the law laid down in **Wasim versus State NCT of Delhi in Criminal Appeal No. 1061 of 2019 dated 18.07.2019** and **M.Mohan versus State in Criminal Appeal No. 611 of 2011 dated 01.03.2011**. Hence, prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner is made.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab, appeared and filed custody certificate of the petitioner, same is taken on record. Learned counsel has not disputed the fact that the case of the petitioner is on the same footings to that of the co-accused Amrit Singh



etc., who have been granted concession of anticipatory bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the investigation qua the present petitioner has already been completed; petitioner is in custody for the last more than six months; that except mentioning of the name of the present petitioner in the suicide note there is nothing incriminating against him, nor has any specific role been attributed to him in the suicide note that what sort of act of harassment was caused by the petitioner which compelled deceased to commit suicide; that Hon'ble Supreme Court, in catena of cases, has held that there should be clear mens rea in order to attract the provisions of section 306 of IPC; that the case of the petitioner is on the same footings to that of the co-accused, who have been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge; trial will take sufficient time to conclude and no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody for any further period, as concession of bail cannot be denied just as measure of punishment as culpability of the accused will be decided at the final stage by the trial Court after appreciating the evidences adduced by both sides and it is trite principle of criminal jurisprudence that bail is rule, jail is an exception, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is **allowed**. The petitioner is ordered to be released



on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

16.04.2026
mamta

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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