

2026.PHHC.019248



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

226

CRM-M-39006-2025

Date of decision: 9th February, 2026

Yuvraj Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Aman Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 127 dated 25.07.2022 registered under Sections 302, 201, 34 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Adampur, District Jalandhar.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement got recorded by the complainant Rajinder Kumar alleging that his elder son Loveleen Kumar had performed marriage with Paramjit Kaur against the wishes of his family due to which he was disowned by the complainant and was residing in village Jalbhai i.e. the native village of his wife. On 25.07.2022, on receipt of an information from Paramjit Kaur regarding death of his son Loveleen Kumar, the complainant rushed to his house and found

2026.PHHC.019248



the dead body of his son lying there. By alleging that some unknown persons had killed his son, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On 28.07.2022, supplementary statement of complainant was recorded, wherein he disclosed that the family members of Paramjit Kaur were not happy with Loveleen Kumar and used to extend threats to him and this fact had been told to him by his son. He raised suspicion that the present petitioner and other family members of Paramjit Kaur had hand in the murder of the victim. The petitioner along with co-accused Bablu, Jaswinder Singh and Shakuntla were nominated as additional accused. The petitioner was arrested on 28.07.2022. He suffered disclosure statement on 24.07.2022, the deceased came to in inebriated condition to the house of the petitioner and raised demand of Rs. 10,000/-. He tried to strangle his own daughter Jashan, who was staying with the petitioner since her childhood. The petitioner and his family members tried to save Jashan but the deceased did not relent. The petitioner had struck 3-4 blows with his bracelet upon the head of the deceased due to which he had fallen down and then accused Bablu had inserted a cloth in the mouth of the victim-Lovleen Kumar, as a result of which he had died. Thereafter, they had taken the dead body of the victim on a bicycle to village Safipur and burnt the same. He also got recovered the used bracelet worn by him and the bicycle used by him in the crime. Investigation now stands completed and the petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

2026.PHHC.019248



3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is no eye-witness to the occurrence and there is no material on record to connect him with the crime. The disclosure statement of the co-accused and himself cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. The co-accused Shakuntla and Jaswinder Singh have been extended benefit of bail. His case is on parity with the co-accused. Trial is likely to take time to conclude. He is in custody for a period of more than three years and six months. No useful purpose would be served by detaining him in custody anymore. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner, who got recovered the bracelet which was used by him for causing injury on the head of the victim. The trial is going at a proper pace as 04 out of 21 prosecution witnesses have been examined and 03 have been given up. The prolonged incarceration in a matter like this cannot be considered to be a ground for extending benefit of bail. It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

6. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have caused homicidal death of the victim, who was none other than his brother-in-law and thereafter alleged to have burnt his dead body and thrown it somewhere to cause disappearance the evidence of offence. The allegations

2026.PHHC.019248



prima facie reveal the presence of the petitioner at the spot at the time of occurrence and his active participation. It is well-settled proposition of law that grant of bail is a discretionary relief to be granted or denied based on specific facts and circumstance of each case and there cannot be any exhaustive parameters set out for considering the application for grant of bail. The factors such as nature of accusations, severity of punishment if the accusations entail a conviction and nature of evidence in support of accusations are to be seen. That apart, reasonable apprehension of tampering with evidence or threatening the material witnesses is also to be weighed. Frivolity of prosecution should always be considered, and it is only the element of genuineness that has to be considered in the matter of grant of bail.

7. In light of the foregoing legal principles and other circumstances as discussed above, this Court finds no compelling ground to allow this petition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is clarified that any observation made in this order is only for deciding this petition and shall not influence the outcome of the trial and also not be taken as an expression of opinion on merits.

9. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

9th February, 2026
Parveen Sharma

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |