



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

**CRM-M-29726-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 01.07.2026**

DEEPINDER SINGH @ DEEPU

...Petitioner

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Bikramjeet Singh Jatana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, DAG Punjab.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in FIR No. 0118 dated 28.04.2026 under Sections 108, 3(5), 351(2) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Lehra, District Sangrur. This is the first petition for anticipatory bail.

2. On 25.05.2026, following order was passed:

“1. Petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 (Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 0118 dated 28.04.2026 under Sections 108, 3(5), 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding to Sections 306, 34, 506 IPC), registered at Police Station Lehra, District Sangrur (Annexure P-1) and for staying the arrest of the petitioner during the pendency of the present petition, in the interest of justice.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the present FIR has been registered on the statement of Taranpreet Singh son of deceased Dashmesh Singh, wherein it has been alleged that

the father of the complainant was doing joint cultivation with co-accused Amrik Singh and the petitioner Deepinder Singh alias Deepu. It is alleged that the accused persons harvested the wheat crop and did not give the share of the complainant party. It has further been alleged that the petitioner had borrowed money from one Anil Kumar Commission Agent, Tohana, for taking land on lease and the said commission agent started demanding the amount from the father of the complainant, due to which he remained under depression. Allegations have also been levelled regarding forcible possession of land by co-accused Amrik Singh. It is further the case of the prosecution that the father of the complainant consumed poisonous substance after allegedly being harassed by the accused persons and before consuming the same, he made a video on his mobile phone alleging harassment at the hands of the accused persons. On the basis of the said allegations, the present FIR No. 0118 dated 28.04.2026 under Sections 108, 3(5), 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, corresponding to Sections 306, 34 and 506 IPC, came to be registered against the petitioner and other co-accused persons at Police Station Lehra, District Sangrur.

3. *Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and no ingredients of the offence under Section 108 of the BNS are made out against him. It is argued that there is no specific allegation showing any direct act, instigation or*

intentional aid on the part of the petitioner which could amount to abetment of suicide. Mere demand of money allegedly borrowed by the deceased does not constitute the offence of abetment. It is further contended that the deceased Dashmesh Singh and the petitioner were jointly cultivating land and had jointly borrowed certain amounts for agricultural purposes. The amount borrowed from co-accused Anil Kumar, Commission Agent, had already been adjusted through sale of crops and an agreement dated 17.04.2025 was also executed between the parties acknowledging the said fact. It is submitted that thereafter no dispute or dealings remained pending between the petitioner and the deceased. Learned counsel further argues that the allegations regarding threats extended by the petitioner on the date of occurrence are false and no material has been collected by the investigating agency to show that any call was made by the petitioner to the deceased on the relevant day. It is also contended that the alleged video attributed to the deceased is doubtful in nature, as only a voice is audible therein and the authenticity of the same is a matter of trial. Even otherwise, the contents of the said video do not disclose the essential ingredients of abetment. It is also argued that the deceased was under financial stress on account of loans taken from various persons and may have taken the extreme step due to his own circumstances, for which the petitioner cannot be held responsible. Counsel submits that no recovery is to be

effected from the petitioner and custodial interrogation is not required. It has further been contended that similarly situated co-accused namely Amrik Singh and Anil Kumar have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur and the case of the present petitioner stands on similar footing. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner is ready to join investigation and abide by all the conditions imposed by this Hon'ble Court.

4. *Notice of motion.*

5. *On asking of the Court, Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and submits that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is contended that prior to committing suicide, the deceased Dashmesh Singh had made a video clip in which he specifically named the present petitioner along with other accused persons and alleged harassment at their hands. The said video clip was also played during the proceedings before the Court below. It is further argued that in the statement forming basis of the FIR, specific allegations have been levelled that even on the day of occurrence, the petitioner had extended threats to the deceased telephonically, which ultimately drove him to take the extreme step. According to the prosecution, the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be required during the course of investigation. Learned State*

counsel thus submits that in view of the specific allegations and the material collected during investigation, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

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

7. *Prima facie, in order to attract the offence of abetment of suicide under Section 108 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 corresponding to Section 306 IPC, there has to be material showing intentional instigation, active aid or conduct on the part of the accused which directly compelled the deceased to commit suicide. Mere existence of monetary transactions, demand of repayment of money or disputes arising out of agricultural dealings, by themselves, would not be sufficient to constitute the offence of abetment unless there is a clear allegation of direct incitement or intentional aid.*

8. *In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are primarily that there were disputes regarding joint cultivation and repayment of certain amounts allegedly borrowed by the deceased and that the petitioner along with co-accused persons was demanding return of the said amount. The role attributed to the petitioner in the FIR is limited to the aforesaid allegations. Except these allegations, there is no specific material at this stage indicating any direct act on the part of the petitioner showing intentional instigation compelling the deceased to take the extreme step.*

9. *So far as the alleged video clip of the deceased is concerned, the same is a matter of evidence, which shall be examined during the course of investigation/trial. Even otherwise, the evidentiary value and authenticity thereof are yet to be tested in accordance with law. This Court also cannot lose sight of the fact that similarly situated co-accused have already been granted the concession of anticipatory bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sangrur.*

10. *Keeping in view the nature of allegations, the role attributed to the petitioner, the fact that custodial interrogation of the petitioner does not appear to be necessary at this stage and in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation as and when called upon to do so by the Investigating Officer and subject further to the conditions envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023.*

11. *Adjourned to 01.07.2026.”*

3. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Sukha Singh submits that petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Petitioner has joined investigation pursuant to order of this Court dated 25.05.2026 and his further custodial interrogation is not required. In the circumstances of the case but without commenting on merits, the petition is allowed and order dated 25.05.2026, granting interim bail to the petitioner, is made absolute, subject to the conditions

laid down in Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

5. Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.

01.07.2026
Ajay Goswami

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

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