



CRM-M-22819-2026 (O&M)

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

218

CRM-M-22819-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.05.2026

RAM NIWAS

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.. RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Ashit Malik, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Maneet Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)CRM-17855-2026

1. Allowed as prayed for.

CRM-M-22819-2026

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (erstwhile Section 439 Cr.P.C.) seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.119 dated 01.06.2024 under Sections 302,148,149 IPC (later on added Section 120-B IPC) (corresponding to Sections 103(1), 191(3), 190 & 61(2) of BNS, 2023), registered at Police Station Patran, District Patiala.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant-Sunita Rani, wife of late Megha Singh, submitted a complaint alleging that Davinder Singh @ Jinder, Jeet Singh, Meeto Kaur, Navjot Kaur, Veermati Kaur, Jarnail Singh @ Jaili, Ramesh Chand, Kala Singh, Laalu, Ladi, and four unknown persons



had inflicted injuries upon her husband, which ultimately led to his death. It is also alleged that these facts were disclosed to the complainant by her husband, Megha Singh (since deceased), when he was being taken to the hospital.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was arraigned as an accused only on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused Davinder Singh who submitted that the petitioner was one of the assailants. It is submitted that besides the disclosure statement, there is no incriminating material qua the petitioner which would connect him with the alleged offence and no recovery has been effected from him. It is further submitted that the disclosure statement allegedly suffered by the co-accused during police custody is not admissible in evidence unless duly corroborated by independent material. Learned Senior counsel further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 11 months and 12 days and co-accused(s), namely, Harmesh Singh @ Mesi @ Ramesh Chand @ Ramesh Singh and Jeet Singh have already been granted bail by this Court in CRM-M-69824-2025 and CRM-M-8731-2026 on 04.02.2026 and 02.04.2026 (Annexures P-3 & P-4). Although the petitioner is involved in other cases but he is on bail in those cases. He, therefore, prays for release of the petitioner on regular bail as the trial is likely to take a long time as only 01 out of 26 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sandeep Kumar, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent and vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate,



the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 11 months and 12 days. He, upon instructions, submits that only 01 out of 26 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year, 11 months and 12 days, co-accused(s) have already been granted bail and that the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude as only 01 out of 26 cited prosecution witnesses has been examined so far, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner during the pendency of the trial as the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice.

8. Reference can be made to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Pardeep Kumar @ Banu versus State of Punjab*, bearing Criminal Appeal No.1341/2026 (arising out of SLP(Cri.) No.18775/2025), decided on 13.03.2026, wherein it has been categorically held that where the accused has remained in custody for a considerable period and the trial has not even commenced, or is not likely to conclude in the near future, therefore, continued incarceration would amount to punishment without trial. In such circumstances, further detention pending trial is not necessary and the accused is entitled to be released on bail.

9. 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 bonds, surety bonds to the



CRM-M-22819-2026 (O&M)

satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

10. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State/complainant would be at liberty to seek cancellation of his bail.

May 20, 2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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