



CRM-M-52892-2025

-1-

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

106

CRM-M-52892-2025

Date of Decision: 25.02.2026

SANDEEP SINGH @ SEEPA

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. K.S.Brar, Advocate and
Mr. Rajat Dogra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Hans, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 172 dated 08.11.2024 under Sections 103 (1) of BNS (Sections 331(8), 332(a), 307, 3(5) of BNS added later on) registered at Police Station, Sadar, Bathinda, District Bathinda.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with his co-accused, trespassed into the house of the complainant at night and murdered the mother of the complainant in order to commit theft. They also stolen her ear rings, money and some important documents.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it is a case of blind murder and no one was named in the FIR. He further submits that the petitioner has been nominated on the basis of a supplementary statement made by the complainant, alleging that his mother was murdered by the petitioner along with Sukhdeep Singh @ Daan and Daler Singh.
4. On the other hand, ld. State counsel opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner is involved in a serious offence and does not



CRM-M-52892-2025

-2-

deserve the concession of bail. He has filed the custody certificate in Court, which is taken on record. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year 03 months and 06 days and is involved in one more case under the IPC. He further submits that a nose ring, earrings, along with the Aadhaar card of the deceased were recovered from the petitioner. He further submits that the statement of a 'last seen' witness was also recorded, who had allegedly seen the petitioner along with his co-accused moving towards the house of the deceased. It is submitted that out of 31 prosecution witnesses only 02 have been examined in part so far.

5. I have heard the submissions made by Id. counsel for the parties and gone through the record.

6. After hearing the rival contentions of learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that it has not been explained how the complainant came to know about the petitioner's involvement in the offence and that there is also doubt regarding the recovery; further considering that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 03 months and 06 days; although the petitioner is involved in another case under the IPC but he has been acquitted in that case; only 02 witnesses have been examined in part so far; and the trial is likely to take a considerable time to conclude, this Court is of the view that further detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose. Moreover, it is a settled principle of law that "*bail is the rule and jail is the exception.*"

7. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on



CRM-M-52892-2025

-3-

regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulged in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

25.02.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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