



CRM-M-28894-2025 and CRM-M-55093-2025

1

109

CRM-M-28894-2025

Harpreet Singh Alias Bhima

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CRM-M-55093-2025

Gagandeep Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

Date of decision: 25.03.2026

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

Present:- Mr. A.S.Brar, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-28894-2025.

Ms. Rinky Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-55093-2025.

Mr. P.S.Pandher, Asst. A.G.Punjab.

Mr. Savreet Brar, Advocate for the complainant.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of two petitions bearing CRM-M-28894-2025 and CRM-M-55093-2025 as these are arising out of same FIR. For brevity, the facts are being taken from CRM-M-28894-2025.
2. These petitions have been filed by the petitioners seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS in case FIR No.62 dated 30.07.2024 under



Sections 103, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Bajakhana, District Faridkot.

3. The case of the prosecution is that Jasjeet Singh @ Jassa was married to Gagandeep Kaur-petitioner, who, due to matrimonial dispute, had been residing at her parental home in Village Thaman, District Moga. About 15–20 days prior to the occurrence, she returned to the matrimonial home at Village Ghania. On the day of the incident, the complainant namely Labhpreet Kaur called her brother Jasjeet Singh @ Jassa who did not take her calls. Later, she called Lakhvir Singh asking him to let her speak to her brother as he was not taking her calls. After sometime, Lakhvir Singh went to the house of her brother and informed her over the phone that her brother Jasjit Singh was lying on bed with blood all over. After some time, Lakhvir Singh informed her telephonically that her brother was lying on the bed with blood all over his body. Upon receiving this information, the complainant went to the house of her brother and, on entering the bedroom, found him lying dead on the bed. He had sustained injuries on his neck caused by a sharp-edged weapon and had succumbed to those injuries. It is alleged that the petitioner, along with co-accused Karan Gill, committed the murder of Jasjeet Singh @ Jassa.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that they have been falsely implicated in the present case. It is contended that petitioner- Harpreet Singh has been nominated solely on the basis of the disclosure statement of co-accused Karan Singh @ Karan Gill, who is the main accused. Counsel appearing in CRM-M-55093-2025 further submits that there is no direct



evidence or witness on record to establish the *mens rea* of the petitioner, namely Gaganpreet Kaur.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant as well as learned State counsel have vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that the petitioners have committed a heinous crime. Custody certificates of the petitioners have been filed in Court today and are taken on record. As per the custody certificates, the petitioners have been in custody for more than 1 year and 7 months. It is further submitted that co-accused Karan Singh @ Karan Gill was the paramour of petitioner namely Gagandeep Kaur, and a blood-stained sharp-edged weapon ('khanda') was recovered pursuant to his disclosure. The challan has been presented, charges have been framed, and out of 24 cited prosecution witnesses, only 2 have been examined so far.

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

7. After hearing the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly that it is a case based on circumstantial evidence and there is no direct evidence collected by the prosecution to implicate the present petitioners in the commission of the offence; the petitioners are in custody for more than 01 years and 07 months; out of 24 cited prosecution witnesses only 02 witnesses have been examined so far; the trial will take a considerable time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served for further incarceration of the petitioners.



CRM-M-28894-2025 and CRM-M-55093-2025

4

Moreover, it is a settled principle of law that “*bail is the rule and jail is the exception.*” Accordingly, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their 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 petitioners are found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of their bail.

11. Pending applications, if any, shall also stand disposed of.

25.03.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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