



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

116

CRM-M No.49170 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 24.02.2026

Arshdeep Singh @ Akash @ Nikka

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Mr. Suresh Kumar Kalia, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

This petition, under Section 483 of the 'Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023', is the second petition, filed by the petitioner for grant of bail. The above mentioned petition pertains to a case arising out of FIR No.20 dated 28.02.2024, under Sections 307, 450, 326-A, 336, 506 and 34 [Sections 302 and 499 added and Section 450 reduced later on] of Indian Penal Code, Police Station Mallanwala.

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this came into being at the instance of 'Dharampreet Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant', only. It was stated by the above named complainant that in his house he was residing with his wife Poonam, aunt Veena and her son Jaspreet Singh. According to complainant his cousin Arshdeep Singh was a drug addict and that 3-4 days ago he abducted a girl and stayed in their home for two days. It was further stated by the complainant that



after two days Arashdeep Singh was ousted from the home, and therefore, he got annoyed and threatened to teach them a lesson. It was further stated by the complainant that on 27.02.2024 when complainant along with his wife was sleeping Arshdeep Singh @ Akash entered in their home by scaling the wall, poured petrol upon them and with an intention to kill set them ablazed. According to complainant he and his wife with great difficulty extinguish the fire with the help of his brother Sukhpreet Singh, aunt Veena and other neighbours, who got them admitted in the hospital.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that in view of above mentioned statement, formal FIR of this case was lodged, and the investigation taken up.

4. The learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, and that he has already suffered prolonged incarceration for being in custody for a period of more than 1 year 11 months and 19 days. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future as not even a single witness has been examined, so far. In view of above mentioned fact-situation it has been claimed by learned counsel for the petitioner that right of speedy trial of the petitioner is being infringed in the present case and therefore, he is entitled for the benefit of bail.

7. The learned State counsel has controverted the above mentioned



arguments. According to learned State counsel there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner with regard to commission of offence of serious nature. As per learned State counsel the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner can be judged from the fact that two persons sleeping in their home were set ablazed by the petitioner for no fault on their part. While claiming that the petitioner does not deserve any sympathy, the learned State counsel has sought for dismissal of present petition.

8. The record has been perused carefully.

A perusal of record shows that following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision in the present petition:-

- i) that there are very specific and categorical allegations of the complainant, against the petitioner, that the petitioner by scaling wall entered into the house and poured petrol on the person of complainant and his wife and set them ablazed;
- ii) that in the present case the motive for the commission of offence has also been explained;
- iii) that there cannot be any dispute with regard to identity of the petitioner as the petitioner is a close relative of the complainant and other victim;
- iv) that the offence committed by the petitioner is of very serious and gruesome nature;
- v) that either in the present petition or during the course of



argument no motive has been attributed to the complainant to
falsely implicated the petitioner in the present petition.

Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the
abovementioned factors, it is hereby observed that the present petition is
devoid of merit and deserve dismissal. Hence the same is hereby dismissed
accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

24.02.2026
Manoj Bhutani

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