



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

233

CRM-M-22220-2026

Date of Decision: 28.04.2026

KULDEEP SINGH ALIAS BHALLA**... PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****... RESPONDENT**

Present:- Mr. Jasmail Singh Brar, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed u/s 483 BNSS read with section 528 BNSS for grant of regular bail in case FIR No. 108. Dated 03.05.2020, under sections 120-B, 148, 149, 302, 450 of the IPC (u/s 61,191(3), 190, 103(1),332(b) of BNS) r/w Sections 25, 27,54,59 of the Arms Act registered at P.S.Sadar Kapurthala in which offence u/s 3 of SC/ST Act vide Rapat no. 29 dated 23.06.2020 (Annexure P-1) (not against the present petitioner) and offence u/s 411,482 IPC (u/s 317(2),345(3) of BNS) vide Rapat no. 27 dated 02.07.2020 (Annexure P-2) were added later on.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with co-accused, committed the murder of Balkar Singh, the brother of the complainant Tirath Singh. The petitioner allegedly inflicted multiple datar blows on the mouth and arms of the deceased.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations against the petitioner are false and fabricated. He further submits that the fatal injury on the body of the deceased has been attributed to the main accused,



namely Bhupinder Singh @ Shera. It is further submitted that a co-accused, namely Harjap Singh, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court. The petitioner is in custody for the last more than 5 years and 11 months and 09 days and the trial is yet to commence. It is further contended that the complainant is before this Court and has challenged the proceedings under Section 319 Cr.P.C.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Rohit Hans, learned DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent–State and has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail on the ground that the petitioner actively participated in the alleged offence and was a part of an unlawful assembly. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court today, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 5 years and 11 months and 09 days; out of 31 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. He further submits that in this case, 6 accused have been challaned. It is further submitted that one FIR has been registered against the petitioner under Section 52-A of the Prisons Act.

6. I have heard the submissions made by the parties and have gone through the record.

7. After hearing the rival contentions and considering the long incarceration of the petitioner, who is in custody for the last 5 years and 11 months and 09 days coupled with the fact that the trial is likely to take considerable time, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be



CRM-M-22220-2026

served by further incarceration of the petitioner. Accordingly, the petitioner is granted the concession of regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

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 bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

28.04.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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