



CRM-M-54709-2025

1

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

Sr. No.120

CRM-M-54709-2025

Date of Decision: 09.03.2026

PARAMJEET SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. BBS Randhawa, Advocate and
Ms. Manu Loona, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 76 dated 05.06.2025 registered under Sections 103, 115(2), 351(2), 191, 190 and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 at Police Station Arniwala, District Fazilka. It is stated that Section 103 of BNS, 2023 was later deleted and Section 105 of BNS, 2023 was subsequently added.

2. Briefly stated, the present FIR was registered on the basis of the statement of the complainant, who alleged that on 04.06.2025 at about 3:30 PM, he along with his brother Budh Parkash and his sister-in-law Manjeet Kaur was working in their cotton fields. It is alleged that several persons



including the present petitioner Paramjeet Singh and other co-accused came there on tractors while being armed with various weapons such as dandas, iron rods, spades and other implements and started demolishing a government sanctioned water course adjoining the fields. When the complainant party objected to the said act, the accused persons allegedly raised lalkara and started assaulting them. As per the allegations, the petitioner Paramjeet Singh gave an iron rod blow on the head of Budh Parkash due to which he fell down and thereafter the other accused persons also gave him beatings. It is further alleged that when the sister-in-law of the complainant tried to rescue him, she was also attacked by some of the accused persons. Thereafter, the injured were taken to Civil Hospital, Fazilka where Budh Parkash was declared dead.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially the case was registered under Section 302 IPC, however, during the course of investigation the said offence was deleted and Section 304 IPC/Section 105 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita was added as the medical opinion revealed that the deceased had died due to heart failure. It is further contended that even the offence under Section 304 IPC is not made out in the present case as the deceased had died a natural death and not on account of any injury caused to him during the occurrence. Learned counsel submits that at the most, the allegations in the present case relate to simple injuries inflicted upon Manjeet Kaur and no injury whatsoever was caused to the deceased. It is argued that the death of the deceased coincidentally occurred on the same date as the alleged occurrence, but the same was on account of heart failure and not due to any assault attributed to the petitioner.



4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the offence under Section 304 IPC has been rightly invoked. It is argued that as per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioner had given an iron rod blow on the head of the deceased and due to the said act the deceased suffered a heart attack and subsequently died. It is thus contended that the petitioner along with other co-accused persons had caused injuries to the deceased and the fact that he died due to heart attack does not dilute the role attributed to the petitioner in the occurrence.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record of the case. Although in the FIR it has been alleged that the petitioner had given an iron rod blow on the head of the deceased Budh Parkash, however, the post-mortem report does not reveal even a single injury on the head or any other part of the body of the deceased. As per the medical opinion, the cause of death of the deceased has been opined to be heart attack. There is nothing on record at this stage to indicate that the said heart attack was the result of any injury suffered by the deceased during the occurrence or that it had any direct nexus with the alleged assault attributed to the petitioner. Thus, the medical evidence, prima facie, does not appear to correspond with the version given by the complainant in the FIR. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about nine months and the conclusion of trial is likely to take considerable time. In such circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars for an indefinite period during the pendency of trial.



6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner Paramjeet Singh is ordered to be released on regular bail subject to his furnishing adequate bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.
7. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
8. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

09.03.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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