

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-15557-2026 (O&M)

Kuldeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	21.04.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	23.04.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	23.04.2026
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

 Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

 Mr. Gursimran Singh Madaan, Advocate and
 Mr. Prabhsimran Singh, Advocate
 for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The instant one is the third petition that has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to him in case bearing FIR No. 295 dated 27.11.2023, registered under Sections 323, 324, 307, 452, 506, 34 and 302 of IPC at Police Station Sadar Ambala, District Ambala. The previous two petitions were dismissed by passing detailed orders on 13.08.2024 and 28.07.2025, respectively.

2026.PHHC.060434




2. The petitioner has been facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences on the allegations that on 27.11.2023, he along with co-accused Gurvinder had assaulted the victim Paramjit Kaur in pursuance of their common intention, thereby leading to her death. The petitioner had been arrested on 29.11.2023.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that after dismissal of his previous petitions, a considerable period of time has elapsed. However, there is no progress in trial as only 01 out of total 17 prosecution witness has been examined so far and the complainant has been partly examined. There are no chances of conclusion of trial in near future. Each day spent by him in custody provides a fresh ground to him to seek concession of bail. His prolonged incarceration militates against his fundamental right guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Hence, it is argued that the petitioner deserves to be granted benefit of regular bail.

4. Status report and custody certificate have been filed by the respondent-State. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has argued that the petitioner was an active participant in the occurrence which led to instantaneous death of the victim Paramjit Kaur. His previous petitions had been dismissed by passing detailed orders. There is no substantive change in the circumstances. The instant one being a successive petition is not maintainable. Even otherwise, no reasonable ground has been made out to allow the present petition keeping in view the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner. Hence, it is argued that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions.



6. The petitioner and co-accused are alleged to have firstly opened attack upon the complainant Ranbir Singh and then upon his mother/victim Paramjit Kaur, thereby resulting into her death. The previous petitions filed by the petitioner have been dismissed by passing detailed orders. This is the third petition filed by him. The well settled proposition of law is that successive bail petition is maintainable. However, such petition to succeed, the petitioner is essentially required to show some substantial change in circumstances. Showing of some superficial and ostensible change does not suffice. The petitioner is accused of committing heinous crime i.e. murder of the victim Paramjit Kaur. The well settled proposition of law is that prolonged incarceration alone cannot be considered to be a reason for grant of bail in cases which attract sentence of life imprisonment or capital punishment in the given circumstances. The petitioner has been in custody for the last about 02 years and 04 months. However, on account of his period of incarceration alone, he cannot be allowed to be enlarged on bail. It cannot be stated that there is any substantial change in circumstances from the dates of dismissal of his previous petitions. Accordingly, finding no compelling ground to allow the present petition, the same is dismissed.

7. It is made clear that the observations made hereinabove are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.04.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No