



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

Sr. No.110

**CRM-M-57227-2025
Date of Decision: 25.02.2026**

NIRPAL SINGH

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Arihant Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 0064 dated 22.07.2020, registered under Section 302 IPC at Police Station Jaurkian, District Mansa.
2. As per the prosecution version, on 21.07.2020 at about 1:30 p.m., the complainant Gurpreet Singh was going to his place of work at Hamara Pump, Jawaharke, on a motorcycle make Splender driven by his cousin Babbu Singh alias Bhinder. When they reached near the bridge on Sirsa-Mansa Road, about 10–12 karam away from the spot, Nirpal Singh alias Jaggu suddenly came in front of their motorcycle.
3. It is alleged that upon stopping of the motorcycle, Nirpal Singh took out a sharp-edged knife from his holster and inflicted a stab injury in the stomach of Babbu Singh. On raising alarm by the complainant, the



accused fled from the spot along with the weapon. The injured was immediately taken to Civil Hospital, Mansa and thereafter referred to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala, where he was declared dead by the doctor.

4. The motive alleged in the FIR is that there was a prior grudge between the accused and the deceased on account of some dispute relating to Jagga Singh, a friend of the deceased. On the basis of the statement of Gurpreet Singh, the present FIR was registered and investigation was set in motion.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is in custody for the last about five years and six months. It is submitted that charges in the present case were framed in March 2021 and out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined so far. The trial is progressing at a very slow pace and the petitioner cannot be made to undergo indefinite pre-trial incarceration. It is contended that prolonged custody without conclusion of trial amounts to punishment before conviction, which is impermissible in law. On these grounds, prayer has been made for grant of regular bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the prayer and submitted that the allegations in the present case are grave and serious in nature. The petitioner is specifically attributed the role of inflicting a knife injury on the abdomen of the deceased with intention to kill him, which ultimately resulted in his death. It is further submitted that the complainant, who is an eye-witness and a material witness, is yet to be examined. In case the petitioner is enlarged on bail, there is every likelihood that he may



influence or intimidate the prosecution witnesses and hamper the fair trial of the case.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record carefully. The allegations against the petitioner are of committing murder by inflicting a fatal knife injury on the deceased. The nature and gravity of the offence and the specific role attributed to the petitioner cannot be lost sight of while considering the prayer for bail.

8. No doubt, out of 19 prosecution witnesses only two have been examined and the petitioner has remained in custody for about five years and six months. The petitioner has also placed on record the proceedings of the trial Court to show that the trial is proceeding at a slow pace. However, mere delay in conclusion of trial, by itself, cannot be a ground to release the petitioner on bail in a case involving serious allegations under Section 302 IPC, particularly when the complainant and other material witnesses are yet to be examined.

9. At the same time, the right of the accused to a speedy trial cannot be ignored. In the interest of justice, the learned trial Court is directed to ensure that the statement of the complainant is recorded within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and to make an endeavour to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible, without granting unnecessary adjournments to either side.

10. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the present bail application is dismissed.



11. However, anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.
12. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

25.02.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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