



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

CRM-M-12972-2026

Date of Decision: 13.03.2026

Date of Uploading: 13.03.2026

Mandeep Singh @ Mani

.....Petitioner.

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Mr. Arkash Mani Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan S. Rai, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J.(Oral)

Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.53 dated 22.05.2024, under Sections 302, 120-B, 201, 34 of IPC [Sections 103, 61(2), 238, 3(5) of BNS], registered at Police Station Amargarh, District Malerkotla.

2. The case set up in the FIR in question (as set out in the present petition by the petitioner) is as follows:-

“Officer Incharge, Police Station Amargarh, "Jai Hind" Today I INSP/SO alongwith ASI Sayad Shakeel 686/LDH(Rural), Incharge Police Post Himatana, HC Gursewak Singh 939/SGR, HC Namandeein 2111/SGR, L/HC Jasvir Kaur 1868/SGR, SC Navdeep Singh 1480/SGR, Ct. Arshdeep Singh 3448/PTL, PHG Sukhwinder Singh 48000 in official vehicle bearing registration No. PB-65F-5266 Mark Scorpio bring driven by SC Ravinder Singh 68/SGR and official vehicle bearing registration No. PB-13AW-4105 Mark Bolero Camper being driven by SC Balvir Singh 1055/SGR with laptop, printer inverter etc. were present at drain bridge Abbaspura on Nabha-Malerkotla road, in connection with investigation of unidentified dead body of

a woman. Then at about 01:30 PM, a secret informer came to I INP/SHO and informed in hurry manner that he was having knowledge about the woman, whose dead body was recovered at the right side of embankment of Naushehra drain near backside of Vishal Paper Mill. That lady was kept by Mandeep Singh alias Mani son of Gurmeet Singh, resident of Sadrabad(Naushehra) with him as Concubine who is son of Ranjit Kaur alias Rani wife of Gurmeet Singh, resident of Sadrabad(Naushehra). Mandeep Singh alias Mani had made illicit relations with that lady and this lady was residing with him and usually, quarrel took place between Mandeep Singh alias Mani and deceased lady because, deceased lady was putting pressure upon Mandeep Singh alias Mani to perform marriage with her but Mandeep Singh alias Mani and his mother Ranjit Kaur alias Rani were not agree for performing marriage. Due to which, their dispute continued for long time. Hence, Mandeep Singh alias Mani and his mother Ranjit Kaur alias Rani had decided to clear this land from their ways. In the intervening night of 21/22.05.2024, they in connivance with some unidentified persons killed that lady and thrown her dead body at some abandon place at Patri of drainage for misappropriating her dead body and thereafter, all of them ran away from their houses after locking the same. This entire incident has been done by Mandeep Singh alias Mani alongwith his mother Ranjit Kaur alias Rani and other un-identified persons. Information is true and reliable. From the contents of information received from secret informer, offence under Section 302,34,120-B,201 I.P.C. is made out. Hence, ruqa is being sent through Ct. Arshdep Singh 3448/PTL to Police Station Amargarh for registration of case under above mentioned offences against Mandeep Singh alias Mani son of Gurmeet Singh, Ranjit Kaur alias Rani wife of Gurmeet Singh, residents of Sadrabad(Naushehra), Police Station Amargarh, District Malerkotla. After registration of case, case number be intimated. Control Room Malerkotla be informed. Special reports be issued. I INSP/SHO alongwith police party are busy in investigation o the spot. Sd/- Jatinderpal Singh INSP Station House Officer, Police Station Amargarh dated 22.05.2024. In the area of drainage bridge Abashpur at 02:15 PM.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has iterated that the petitioner is in custody since 22.08.2024. Learned counsel has further argued that the petitioner has been falsely implicated into the FIR in question. Learned counsel has further submitted that the case in hand is not one of eye-witness account. Learned counsel has further submitted that the prime prosecution evidence available against the petitioner is in the shape of disclosure as also recovery of one *dupatta* of co-accused Ranjit Kaur alias Rani, which is used in the commission of offence. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is in custody for more than 01 year and 06 months. Thus, regular bail is prayed for.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the present petition by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in

nature and, thus, he does not deserve the concession of the regular bail. Learned State counsel seeks to place on record custody certificate dated 12.03.2026 in the Court, which is taken on record.

5. I have heard counsel for the rival parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

6. The petitioner was arrested on 22.08.2024, wherein after investigation was carried out; Challan stands prepared on 19.11.2024 and was filed subsequently. It is not in dispute that total 16 prosecution witnesses have been cited, out of which one has been partly examined. It is thus indubitable that culmination of trial will take its own time. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Criminal Appeal No.2787 of 2024*** titled as ***Javed Gulam Nabi Shaikh vs. State of Maharashtra and another***, decided on 03.07.2024; relevant whereof reads as under:-

“19 If the State or any prosecuting agency including the court concerned has no wherewithal to provide or protect the fundamental right of an accused to have a speedy trial as enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution then the State or any other prosecuting agency should not oppose the plea for bail on the ground that the crime committed is serious. Article 21 of the Constitution applies irrespective of the nature of the crime.

20. We may hasten to add that the petitioner is still an accused; not a convict. The over-arching postulate of criminal jurisprudence that an accused is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty cannot be brushed aside lightly. howsoever stringent the penal law may be.

21. We are convinced that the manner in which the prosecuting agency as well as the Court have proceeded, the right of the accused to have a speedy trial could be said to have been infringed thereby violating Article 21 of the Constitution.”

6.1 The rival contentions raised at Bar give rise to debatable issues, which shall be ratiocinated upon during the course of trial. This Court does not deem it appropriate to delve deep into these rival contentions, at this stage, lest it may prejudice the trial. Nothing tangible has been brought forward to indicate the likelihood of the petitioner absconding from the process of justice or interfering with the prosecution evidence.

6.2 As per custody certificate dated 12.03.2026 filed by the learned State counsel, the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 01 year, 06 months and 15 days.

7. In view of above, the present petition is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Ld. concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, in addition to conditions that may be imposed by the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner shall remain bound by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioner shall not mis-use the liberty granted.
- (ii) The petitioner shall not tamper with any evidence, oral or documentary, during the trial.
- (iii) The petitioner shall not absent himself on any date before the trial.
- (iv) The petitioner shall not commit any offence while on bail.
- (v) The petitioner shall deposit her passport, if any, with the trial Court.
- (vi) The petitioner shall give his cellphone number to the Investigating Officer/SHO of concerned Police Station and shall not change his cell-phone number without prior permission of the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate.

(vii) The petitioner shall not in any manner try to delay the trial.

8. In case of breach of any of the aforesaid conditions and those which may be imposed by concerned CJM/Duty Magistrate as directed hereinabove or upon showing any other sufficient cause, the State/complainant shall be at liberty to move cancellation of bail of the petitioner.

9. Ordered accordingly.

10. Nothing said hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

March 13, 2026
Yag Dutt

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No