



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

CRM-M-21176-2026

Date of decision : 24.04.2026

Kuldeep Singh @ Kuldeep Suniar

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. H.S. Multani, Advocate and
Mr. Ramaninder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

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.351 dated 14.08.2018, under Sections 306, 506 of IPC (corresponding Sections 108, 351(2) of BNS), registered at Police Station City Barnala.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Satnam Singh. It was alleged that on 13.08.2018, at about 02:00 P.M., he along with his father Sheetal Singh and mother Savinder Kaur was present in the house. His father Sheetal Singh was dealing in the business of buffaloes and his money was in circulation in the market in the said business. Kuldeep Singh (present petitioner) came to their house and raised demand of money. Sheetal Singh tried to pacify him by saying that he would give money to him after making arrangement of the same, but Kuldeep Singh was extending threats of life to his father and being fed up with the attitude of Kuldeep Singh, his father poured some poisonous substance in the glass



and consumed the same and thereafter started vomiting. On seeing the condition of his father, Kuldeep Singh ran away. Satnam Singh got admitted his father to Civil Hospital, Barnala, from where he was referred to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala, where his father had died. Thus the request was made to take legal action against the culprits. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. Resultantly, the petitioner was arrested on 25.02.2026. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Barnala praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Barnala declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 03.04.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He has submitted that on registration of the FIR, petitioner was granted anticipatory bail on 04.09.2018 by the trial Court due to his absence during trial. Thereafter, he was declared a Proclaimed Offender on 13.11.2025 and after about 3 months, petitioner was arrested on 25.02.2026 and since then, he is behind the bars. He has submitted that from the facts and circumstances of the case, it is apparent that no offence under Section 306 read with Section 107 IPC is made out as no instigation can be inferred in the facts and circumstances of the case. He has submitted that the petitioner is more than 60 years of age who is confined to the wheelchair. To buttress his arguments, learned counsel has submitted that the petitioner has no



criminal antecedents as he has never been involved in any other case. He thus, has submitted that the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State however has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner was granted anticipatory bail but he was declared a Proclaimed Offender as he misused the concession of bail. He, on instructions, has submitted that out of 15 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date. He has placed on record custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner was granted anticipatory bail on 04.09.2018 but as he remained absent, he was declared a Proclaimed Offender on 13.11.2025. It has been contended before this Court that the offence under Section 306 read with Section 107 IPC is not even made out against the petitioner. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 month and 29 days as on 23.04.2026. Custody certificate further shows that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of total 15 prosecution witnesses, no witness has been examined till date.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out



a case for the grant of 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.

24.04.2026
m.sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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