

2026:PHHC:036663



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

113

CRM-M-43735-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision : 10.03.2026

Satwinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. R. K. Girdhar, Advocate
For the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.246, dated 02.10.2022, under Sections 302 and 201 of IPC at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of the statement recorded by the complainant Balwinder Singh alleging therein that the petitioner, who was related to him and used to visit his house, had started keeping an evil eye on Manpreet Kaur, wife of his son Sandeep Singh. This fact had come to the knowledge of Sandeep Singh and he had shown displeasure to the father of the petitioner, due to which, the petitioner was offended and used to proclaim that Sandeep Singh would have to pay a price for the same. Though a compromise was got effected between them with the intervention of the Panchayat, however, the petitioner was nursing a grudge against the son of the complainant. The complainant further alleged that on

2026:PHHC:036663



the evening of 25.09.2022, his son Sandeep Singh was present in his house, when he received a call from someone and in response to the same, he went out of his house. He did not return. A missing report was lodged by the complainant on 28.09.2022 and he kept on making search for his son at his own level. Then, he had come to know that the petitioner had taken his son on 25.09.2022 in a Maruti car, had killed him and then had thrown his dead body in Rajasthan feeder canal.

3. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded. The dead body of the victim was recovered on 03.10.2022 from Rajasthan feeder canal. The petitioner was arrested on 04.10.2022. He suffered disclosure statement and got recovered the wallet of the deceased and one iron rod. A CCTV footage was procured by the police, which was showing the petitioner while taking the victim in a Maruti car on the fateful day. It was also revealed that he had made a call to the victim on 24.09.2024. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He did not commit murder of the victim. In fact, he was illegally detained at Police Station Lambi from 25.09.2022 till 02.10.2022. His car was taken into possession by the police. His arrest was wrongly shown on 04.10.2022, only after registration of the FIR. A false evidence has been created by the police by putting scratches on the car owned by him. His mother had even filed applications with regard to his false implication. The prayer had also been made for preservation of the CCTV footage of the camera installed in the Police Station Lambi w.e.f. 25.09.2022

2026:PHHC:036663



but the same had not been preserved intentionally by the police officials. The petitioner is in custody since long. Only one out of total twenty seven prosecution witnesses has been examined so far. The conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. A false recovery of wallet of the deceased has also been planted upon him. There is no eyewitness to the occurrence. It is a case of blind murder and no circumstance has been collected to connect him with the subject offences. No useful purpose would be served by keeping him in custody anymore. Hence, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed and the petitioner deserves to be released on bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature. The complainant has duly supported the prosecution version. He had deposed before the learned trial Court that PW Rajinder Singh had informed him that on 25.09.2022, he had seen the petitioner while striking blows with an iron rod on the head of victim Sandeep Singh, taking his wallet and cell phone from his pocket and throwing his dead body into Rajasthan feeder canal after committing his murder. This witness is yet to be examined. The petitioner is also seen in the CCTV footage along with the victim. Trial may be expedited. Hence, it is urged that the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. This Court has considered the submissions made by both the sides.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have caused homicidal death of victim Sandeep Singh. He was named in the FIR. Though there is delay in lodging of the FIR, however, it is apparent that report regarding missing of the victim had been lodged by the complainant on 28.09.2022 itself. The

2026:PHHC:036663



complainant stands examined and has duly supported the prosecution version. As per the allegations, the CCTV footage, procured during investigation, shows that the victim was with the petitioner on the fateful day and this CCTV footage has also been made part of the challan report. PW Rajinder Singh and PW Jagroop Singh, who gave CCTV footage, are yet to be examined. Some call details record has also been collected showing that just one day prior to the incident, the petitioner had made a phone call to the victim. Prima facie, there was motive with the petitioner to eliminate the victim. The allegations against him are quite serious. The trial has undoubtedly prolonged to some extent. However, the well settled proposition of law is that mere prolonged period of custody is not sufficient ground for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made in ***Parmod Kumar Saxena Vs. UOI, 2008(63) ACC (SC), Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC, 242 and State through CBI Vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)***. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court finds no compelling ground to grant bail to the petitioner. 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.

10.03.2026

Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No