



CRM-M-55129-2025

1

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

134

CRM-M-55129-2025

Decided on :26.02.2026

Jaswant Singh alias Nikka

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Navjot Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.45 dated 22.03.2024, under Sections 302, 34 of BNS, registered at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar.

2. FIR was registered by complainant-Nirmal Singh, stating that his brother-Amarjit Singh, who was married to Rajwinder Kaur about 16 years ago, had gone to the house of his in-laws on 21.03.2024 on a motorcycle bearing registration No. PB 02 CU 9739. When Amarjit Singh did not return, efforts were made to trace him by visiting his in-laws' house. At about 9:30 p.m., his dead body was found.

Subsequent to the registration of the FIR, on 25.03.2024, a supplementary statement of complainant-Nirmal Singh was recorded alleging that accused Jaswant Singh, Nanak Singh, and Rajja w/o Nanak Singh had killed Amarjit Singh by hatching a conspiracy, as Amarjit Singh was allegedly having an affair with Rajja w/o Nanak Singh.

However, it is noticed that on 24.03.2024, statement of Sarpanch Prabh Singh was recorded, in which he reported an alleged



CRM-M-55129-2025

2

extra-judicial confession made by petitioner-Jaswant Singh and co-accused-Ninder Singh. According to this confession, petitioner-Jaswant Singh stated that he was instructed by Baba Khetarpal Ji to perform a human sacrifice, and, as a result, he along with co-accused-Ninder Singh killed Amarjit Singh using a sugarcane “toka” as directed by Baba Khetarpal Ji.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that co-accused Nanak Singh and Rajjo were declared innocent during investigation (paragraph No. 7 of the status report dated 27.11.2025). Therefore, it appears that petitioner-Jaswant Singh, has been facing trial since his involvement in the case w.e.f. 25.03.2024, i.e., from the date of the complainant’s supplementary statement.

4. Counsel further submits that case of the prosecution is entirely dependent on circumstantial evidence, including the disclosure statement of co-accused and the alleged extra-judicial confession before Sarpanch Prabh Singh. Counsel also submits that co-accused Nanak Singh, who was initially implicated, was declared innocent, which weakens the prosecution’s narrative.

Petitioner is in custody for a period of last one year and ten months. The process of recording statements of the prosecution witnesses has not yet commenced. In view of the above circumstances, learned counsel prays for the grant of **regular bail** to the petitioner.

**CRM-M-55129-2025****3**

5. Learned State counsel opposes the grant of regular bail to petitioner-Jaswant Singh, submitting that the case involves a premeditated murder, and the prosecution relies on circumstantial evidence, including the disclosure statement of co-accused and an alleged extra-judicial confession. Considering the gravity of the offence, learned State counsel prays for dismissal of present petition.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book as well as the documents appended thereto.

7. Undoubtedly, considering the circumstances of the case, including the petitioner's long pre-trial custody of over one year and ten months, the fact that the case against him is largely based on circumstantial evidence and an alleged extra-judicial confession, and that the statements of prosecution witnesses are yet to be recorded, this Court is of the view that continue custodial detention is not warranted at this stage. In view of the above, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.



CRM-M-55129-2025

4

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

26.02.2026
Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*