



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

CRM-M-18372-2025

Date of decision : 30.03.2026

Gurjant Singh @ Janta

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Aditya Sanghi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

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.269 dated 13.04.2024, under Sections 302, 120-B, 379, 427 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Sirsa City, District Sirsa.

2. Succinctly facts of the case are that the FIR has been lodged on the statement of Angrej Singh. It was alleged that the marriage of his elder sister namely, Karamjeet Kaur was solemnized with Gurjeet Singh about 16 years ago. His brother-in-law Gurjeet Singh was addicted to liquor and he used to quarrel and give beatings to his sister Karamjeet Kaur. Since last one year, Gurjeet Singh was residing with his elder brother Harjinder Singh and his wife Manpreet alias Monika at Khairpur, Sirsa whereas, his sister and nephew Navdeep Singh were residing at Preet nagar, Gali no.11, Sirsa. Gurjeet Singh oftenly used to visit at the house of his sister and used to threaten his sister and his nephew to vacate the house otherwise he will kill them and Harjinder Singh and his wife Manpreet alias Monika used to support Gurjeet. On that day i.e. 13.04.2024,



Karamjit Kaur made a call to him and told that she alongwith her friend Priyanka wife of Narender Singh, resident of Street No.14, Preet Nagar Sirsa was going from her house to Chilla Sahib Gurudwara, Sirsa via Begu Road on her scooty and at about 5:00 AM when they reached at Kalyan Nagar, Begu Road Sirsa then her husband Gurjeet Singh in order to kill her crushed them alongwith their scooty while driving truck No.HR-57-A-2325 as a result of which Priyanka died at the spot and her condition was also critical and thereafter, voice call of his sister Karamjeet Kaur stopped. His sister was got admitted in Government Hospital Sirsa with the help of ambulance where doctor keeping in view the critical condition of his sister, referred her to Agroha Medical Hospital where she breathed her last. It was further alleged that Gurjeet Singh with intention to kill his sister, committed the murder of his sister Karamjit Kaur and her friend Priyanka who were riding on the scooty with his truck. It was alleged that as Gurjeet Singh was having illicit relations with his sister-in-law (Bhabhi) namely Manpreet alias Monika, Gurjeet Singh has committed this murder after hatching a conspiracy with his brother Harjinder and his wife Manpreet alias Monika. Hence, request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. Petitioner was arrested on 19.04.2024. He approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sirsa, praying for grant of bail, however, after hearing counsel for the parties and finding no merits, the same was declined vide order dated 09.01.2025. Hence, being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has

contended that as per the case of the prosecution, neither the petitioner was



named in the FIR nor any active role has been attributed to him. He has submitted that on registration of the FIR, on the disclosure statement of co-accused namely, Gurjeet Singh @ Gappa i.e. husband of deceased, Karamjeet, petitioner was arrayed as accused. He has submitted that as per the disclosure statement of co-accused, role assigned to the petitioner was to shoot the deceased in case the co-accused failed to kill the deceased by the truck. He has submitted that both the deceased as per the case of prosecution were crushed under the truck which was being driven by the co-accused i.e. husband of deceased, Karamjeet. He has contended that neither the petitioner used the firearm weapon allegedly recovered nor he had played any role in committing the offence. He has contended that except the disclosure statement of co-accused and the alleged recovery of the weapon, the prosecution has no credible evidence. Even otherwise, the disclosure statement of co-accused in itself is not an admissible evidence. He has contended that the petitioner is behind the bars from last about 02 years and till date, only 01 witness has been examined out of 33 prosecution witnesses. He has submitted that the petitioner has not been involved in any other case of the similar nature. He has submitted that though there are other two cases against the petitioner, however, he is on bail in the same. He thus, has prayed that the petitioner deserves to be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the complicity of the petitioner surfaced during investigation. He has submitted that petitioner was very much part of the conspiracy. He has contended that the present case pertains to a double murder. He has



submitted that the petitioner was part of the conspiracy with co-accused in committing the murder. He has submitted that during investigation, call details records of the petitioner were recovered and they were found very much in the vicinity where both the deceased were crushed by the co-accused under the truck. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 33 prosecution witnesses, only 01 witness has been examined till date. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was arrayed as accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. As per the case of the prosecution, firearm weapon have been recovered from the petitioner and this firearm was to be used by the petitioner in case co-accused failed to crush the deceased under the truck. However, it is evident from the case of the prosecution that the deceased were crushed under the truck by the co-accused. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that the petitioner has undergone the sentence of 01 year, 11 months and 10 days as on 28.03.2026. It further reflects that though the petitioner is involved in 02 more cases, however, in 01 case, he is on bail. As submitted out of 33 prosecution witnesses, 01 witness has been examined till date.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the cases will take sufficiently long time. However, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that learned Senior counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

7. If the petitioner does not furnish the bail bonds within seven days from today, then his further custody period after one week will not be counted in the present case.

30.03.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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