



CRM-M-46054 of 2025

-1-

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

236

CRM-M-46054 of 2025

Date of Decision: 06.02.2026

Amrinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present: Mr. Bipan Ghai, Sr. Advocate with  
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate and  
Ms. Malini Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Aiman J. Chisthi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Himanshu Puri, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.63 dated 21.04.2021 registered under Sections 460, 394, 188, 302 and 34 of the IPC, at Police Station Lahori Gate, District Patiala.

2. Brief facts of the present case as per the prosecution are that the petitioner along with other co-accused, after committing robbery at the house of the complainant, committed murder of his mother.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He argued that the

**CRM-M-46054 of 2025****-2-**

petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor has any concern with the said offence and initially, the FIR was registered against unknown persons. He further argued that there is no eye-witness of the alleged incident and entire case is based on hearsay and circumstantial evidence. He argued that the present petitioner has been nominated in this case as an accused only on the basis of suspicion without any concrete evidence, that too only upon the supplementary statement of the complainant made on 25.04.2021 i.e. after an unexplained delay of 04 days of registration of the FIR, casting serious doubt on the prosecution story. The petitioner is in custody since 25.04.2021. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. He further submits that there are total 39 prosecution witnesses and out of which, 13 have been examined till date and as such, the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping him behind bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record and while referring to the status report already filed in the matter, she has opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. She argued that during investigation, it has been found that clerk of complainant Vikramjit Singh @ Vikram in connivance with the petitioner and one friend Gagandeep Singh had committed the murder of the mother of the complainant. Hence, she prays that the present petition be dismissed.



CRM-M-46054 of 2025

-3-

5. Learned counsel for the complainant adopts the submissions made by learned State counsel and while opposing the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious in nature as he along with co-accused has committed heinous crime of murder of mother of the complainant. The petitioner was specifically nominated in the disclosure statement of the co-accused, which affirms the role of the petitioner in the alleged crime. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking bail mainly on the ground of his prolonged custody. It is trite law that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Kalyan Chandra Sarkar v. Rajesh Ranjan @ Pappu Yadav, 2004 AIR(SC) 1866*, *Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav v. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC 242* and *State through CBI v. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005 (4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)*.

7. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner, recovery of motor-cycle and mobile phone of the deceased-Devi Singh from the petitioner coupled with the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment upon the merits

CRM-M-46054 of 2025

-4-

thereof, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

8. Accordingly, the present petition being bereft of any merit, is dismissed.

06.02.2026

*D.Bansal*

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No