



CRM-M-26367-2025

-1-

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

CRM-M-26367-2025

Date of decision: 15.01.2026

SANDEEP SINGH

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Amit Choudhary, 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.47, dated 26.02.2024, under Sections 302, 328, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Ratia, District Fatehabad.
2. Succinctly the facts of the case is that the FIR was lodged on the statement of the complainant, namely, Makhan Singh. It was alleged that his sister Rani Devi-deceased was married to Vikramjeet Singh. There was matrimonial dispute going on between them. Hence, Vikramjeet Singh started leaving separately from her. However, from about last 5-6 months, he joined the company of his wife and children. On 26.02.2024, he received a call from his brother-in-law, namely, Vikramjeet Singh that his sister had been killed and her dead body is lying in the house. On receiving the information, he reached the matrimonial house of his sister and found her lying dead. He found that there were marks of injuries on the face and neck of his sister and brother-in-law was also present. His niece, namely, Amandeep Kaur, Puja and nephew, Maninder Singh @ Mani were vomiting. It was suspected that someone had administered

**CRM-M-26367-2025****-2-**

some poison substances to them, and, his sister has been killed by brick blows. The request was made to take legal action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, on 28.02.2024, the supplementary statement of the complainant, namely, Makhan Singh has been recorded who deposed that his niece, namely, Amandeep Kaur has made an extra judicial confession that she in connivance with her boyfriend, namely, Sandeep Kumar (present petitioner) administered sleeping pills in the tea to her mother and her brothers and sisters. Thereafter, they fell unconscious, and thereafter, were given brick blows on her face and head. When she and her boyfriend were talking inside the bathroom of the house, her mother came there and started speaking loudly to them. Thus, they killed Rani Devi. On the basis of the same, the petitioner was arrayed as an accused and he was arrested on 28.02.2024. On completion of the investigation, the challan was presented. On framing of charges, trial commenced. He approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad for grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad declined the bail application vide order dated 19.03.2025. Thus, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner and whole family has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner is neither related to the family of the deceased nor he has any concern with them, however, he has been implicated in the present case on the basis of presumptions and assumptions. He further submits that the case of the prosecution is totally based on the circumstantial evidences. It is alleged that

**CRM-M-26367-2025****-3-**

before the complainant on the basis of which the petitioner has been roped in the present case. He further submits that the petitioner had not made extra judicial confession and the extra judicial confession made by the co-accused is not even admissible evidence. He further submits that the complainant has been examined before the trial Court as PW-5 and he has not supported the case of the prosecution and thus, he was declared hostile. He further submits besides the alleged extra judicial confession, the prosecution has no other evidence for the complicity of the petitioner. He further submits even otherwise, in a case based on circumstantial evidences, the prosecution is bound to prove the complete chain of evidences. He further submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and is behind bars since 28.02.2024. Thus, in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that the petitioner had a clear motive to eliminate the deceased, as co-accused Amandeep Kaur, who is the daughter of the deceased, was in a relationship with the petitioner, and both, in a pre-planned manner, after administering poison to Rani Devi, caused her death. He further submits that out of 26 prosecution witnesses, 19 have been examined. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court and the same is taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the case of prosecution is based on the circumstantial evidences. The extra judicial confession as submitted before this Court has been made by the co-accused, Amandeep Kaur. The complainant before whom the extra

**CRM-M-26367-2025****-4-**

of the prosecution. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has completed incarceration of 01 year, 10 months and 16 days as on 14.01.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Out of 26 prosecution witnesses, 19 have been examined.

7. 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.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the custody and antecedents of the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. 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.

15.01.2026
renubala

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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