



CRM-M-26809-2026

-1-

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

222

**CRM-M-26809-2026
Date of Decision: 18.05.2026**

DALER SINGH**... PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**... RESPONDENT****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL**

Present:- Mr. Judgepreet Singh Warring Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 172 dated 08.11.2024 under Sections 103 (1) of BNS (Corresponding Section 302 of IPC, 1860) s subsequently added Sections 331(8), 332 (a), 307, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (Corresponding Sections 460,449,382 and 34 of IPC, 1860) registered at Police Station, Sadar, Bathinda, District Bathinda.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with his co-accused, trespassed into the house of the complainant at night and murdered the mother of the complainant in order to commit theft. They also stolen her ear rings, money and some important documents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case of blind murder and no one was named in the FIR. He further submits that the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of a supplementary statement made by the



complainant, alleging that his mother was murdered by the petitioner along with Sukhdeep Singh @ Daan and Sandeep Singh @ Seepa.

4. On the other hand, Id. State counsel opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner is involved in a serious offence and does not deserve the concession of bail. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year 05 months and 28 days and is involved in one more case under the IPC. He further submits that half burnt documents were recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that the statement of a 'last seen' witness was also recorded, who had allegedly seen the petitioner along with his co-accused moving towards the house of the deceased. It is submitted that out of 31 prosecution witnesses only 02 have been examined in part so far.

5. I have heard the submissions made by Id. counsel for the parties and gone through the record.

6. After hearing the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that it has not been explained how the complainant came to know about the petitioner's involvement in the offence and that there is also doubt regarding the recovery; further considering that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year 05 months and 28 days; although the petitioner is involved in another case under the IPC but he has been released on bail in that case; only 02 witnesses have been examined in part so far; and the trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude, this Court is of the view that further detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose.



7. 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.
8. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
9. 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.

18.05.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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