



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

221

CRM-M-27763-2026
Date of decision: 21.05.2026

MANJINDER KUMAR

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Navdeep Singh, Advocate and
Mr. Jainainder Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant **first petition** has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 128 dated 18.08.2024, registered under Section(s) 302 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Cantt. Jalandhar, Police Commissionerate, District Jalandhar.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that the case of the petitioner at par with co-accused Sonia to whom concession of regular bail has already been granted vide order dated 19.01.2026 passed in CRM-M-995 of 2026. It is submitted that the petitioner is alleged to be the paramour of Sonia, who happens to be the wife of the deceased Happy. Learned counsel further submits that the nature of allegations and the evidentiary material relied upon by the prosecution against

the present petitioner are substantially similar to those attributed to the said co-accused.

3. Learned State counsel does not dispute the aforesaid factual position. It is also not disputed that the exact cause of death of the deceased Happy has remained undetermined inasmuch as neither any postmortem examination was conducted nor any report from the CFSL was obtained during the course of investigation. Consequently, according to the prosecution itself, the matter rests primarily upon suspicion that the deceased may have been administered some poisonous substance in a clandestine manner, resulting in his death.

4. I have heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and have gone through the documents appended alongwith the present petition.

5. Without commenting on the merits of the present case and taking into consideration the fact that the prosecution case involves arguable questions regarding involvement of the petitioner, coupled with the circumstance that co-accused has already been granted the concession of regular bail, as also the absence of any recovery from the petitioner and the stage of the trial proceedings, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.
8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

MAY 21, 2026
Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No