



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

226

1) CRM-M-42345-2025
Decided on : 02.02.2026

Sukhbir Singh alias Ramu . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

2) CRM-M-71633-2025

Sukhdeep Singh alias Kola . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-42345-2025).

Mr. Manpreet Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Shivani Dhingra, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-71633-2025).

Mr. Rahul Kumar Adhia, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-42345-2025 & CRM-M-71633-2025, as both the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-42345-2025.
2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Sukhbir Singh alias Ramu (petitioner in CRM-M-42345-	52	20.03.2022	346 of IPC, 1860 [Offence u/s 364-A, 302, 201 of IPC were added vide Rapat No.30, dated 19.12.2022 and	Kotbhai	Sri Muktsar Sahib

2025			offence u/s 120-B of IPC added vide Rapat No.23, dated 21.12.2022]		
Sukhdeep Singh alias Kola (petitioner in CRM-M-71633-2025)					

3. A few facts necessary for adjudication of the cases may be noticed.

On 20.03.2022, FIR was got registered at the instance of the complainant – Manjit Singh, regarding the missing of his son, namely Nirmal Singh, since 19.03.2022. Initially, the complainant did not raise suspicion against any person. However, during the course of investigation, the complainant saw CCTV footage from the vicinity and identified one Navjot Singh @ Joti, who was seen in the footage taking the complainant’s son Nirmal Singh on his motorcycle.

As per status report dated 06.10.2025, accused Navjot Singh @ Joti was joined in investigation, but no information could be elicited from him initially. Subsequently, as per the case of the prosecution, said Navjot Singh @ Joti got recovered a pair of shoes of the deceased as well as skeletonized bones of the dead person on 20.03.2022. It is on the basis of the disclosure statement of accused Navjot Singh @ Joti that the case of the prosecution was further developed and accused (i) Navjot Singh @ Joti, (ii) Mandeep Singh @ Gaggu, (iii) Jagmeet Singh @ Bittu @ Moosi, (iv) Sukhbir Singh @ Ramu (petitioner in CRM-M-42345-2025), (v) Sukhdeep Singh @ Kola (petitioner in CRM-M-71633-2025), and one Babu Singh Sarpanch were nominated as accused.

As per the disclosure statement of the said accused, Babu Singh Sarpanch was a politically influential person and he allegedly directed them to fracture the legs and arms of the deceased and assured that he would

handle the situation thereafter.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners argue that no direct evidence has been collected against either of the petitioners during investigation. They have been implicated only on the basis of the disclosure statement of accused – Navjot Singh @ Joti. It is also not the case of the prosecution that any of the petitioners were seen in any CCTV footage accompanying the deceased at any point of time.

It is further submitted that it is a settled proposition of law that mere involvement on the basis of a disclosure statement, is not sufficient to sustain the allegations of murder. Besides, both the petitioners are stated to be in custody for the last about three years. Learned counsel further submits that when the case of the prosecution is primarily based on disclosure statements and circumstantial/scientific evidence, prolonged incarceration of the petitioners would not serve any meaningful purpose. Hence, prayer for grant of regular bail is made on their behalf.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed one another status report dated 01.02.2026 (in CRM-M-71633) in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

6. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that once the dead body itself has been recovered at the instance of accused – Navjot Singh @ Joti, and details furnished by him in his disclosure statement cannot be brushed aside at this stage and carry some evidentiary value.

Apart from the recovery of the dead body of the deceased, other incriminating evidence, such as a pair of shoes belonging to the deceased,

which he was wearing at the time of leaving his house, has also been recovered during investigation. Learned State counsel, therefore, submits that keeping in view the nature and gravity of the offence, as well as the manner in which the occurrence is alleged to have taken place, the petitioners do not deserve any leniency at this stage and prays for dismissal of the present bail petitions.

7. Heard.

8. At this point, on being specifically asked by the Court, learned State counsel, on instructions submits that after the arrest of the present petitioners, no recovery whatsoever has been effected from their possession. It is, however, submitted that in the confessional statements allegedly made by them while in police custody, certain facts regarding causing injuries to the deceased – Nirmal Singh have been admitted.

Learned State counsel fairly concedes that except for such statements made during police custody, there is no other independent recovery or direct material collected against the petitioners so far, connecting them with the commission of the alleged offence.

9. Again, on being asked by the Court, and as also reflected from the record including the FSL report, it has been gathered that the DNA report in the present case is still awaited, which was forwarded to the concerned laboratory on 14.02.2023. The absence of such crucial scientific evidence at this stage is also a relevant circumstance to be taken into consideration.

Besides, it is also noticeable that out of the total cited 28 prosecution witnesses, only 14 witnesses have been examined so far, though the petitioners have been in custody for about three years. The pace of trial, therefore, appears to be considerably slow and its conclusion in the near future is not in sight.

Present case is admittedly based on circumstantial evidence and the culpability of the petitioners is yet to be proved by the prosecution beyond the shadow of reasonable doubt during the course of trial. In these circumstances, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court, after considering the overall facts and the submissions addressed by learned counsel for both sides, does not deem it appropriate to further curtail the personal liberty of the petitioners for an indefinite period.

10. Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

Petitions stand disposed of.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

February 02, 2026
J.Ram

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