



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

CRM-M-57437-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 05.05.2026

Jagpreet Singh @ Jaggu

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHIST

Present: Mr. Ajay Pal Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner (**Legal Aid Counsel**).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate with
Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

CRM-16324-2026

1. This is an application for placing on record copies of bail order(s) dated 17.10.2023 & 29.04.2024 as Annexures P-5 & P-6, respectively.
2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, same is allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.
3. Annexures P-5 & P-6 are taken on record. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

**Main case**

This is second petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No. 158 dated 17.09.2022 registered under Section 302 read with Section 34 IPC (Section 379 and 201 IPC added later on), at Police Station Kamboj, District Amritsar Rural, Amritsar.

2. As per allegations, incident of murder took place on 16.09.2022 at about 09.00 p.m and thereupon complaint for registration of FIR was moved by the complainant Karnail Singh, father of deceased-Yudhbir Singh on 17.09.2022. As per allegations in the FIR, about 06 years back, love marriage of deceased Yudhbir Singh, and co-accused Manreet Kaur was solemnized and one daughter, namely, Jasleen Kaur was born out of the said wedlock. There was regular fight between the husband and wife, therefore, complainant had separated from them and raised one wall inside the house and; thus created two separate portions. On 16.09.2022 at about 10.00 p.m, complainant heard a noise from the portion of the house where his son (now deceased) used to reside and on going there, he noticed that his son Yudhbir Singh, wearing an underwear, was lying on the bed and both his legs were held by his wife Manreet Kaur. Co-accused Gurjant Singh was holding the arms and Jagpreet Singh (petitioner herein) was pressing the face of Yudhbir Singh with a pillow.

3. On seeing the complainant, all of them suddenly got perplexed and by pushing him, they all fled away on their motorcycle. In the FIR, complainant has alleged that his daughter-in-law Manreet Kaur is of loose



character and had earlier also left his son and had gone to her parental house. However, on convening of panchayat, she was brought back to the matrimonial home after entering into compromise.

4. As per post-mortem report, there are total four injuries noticed on the person of the deceased Yudhbir Singh. The injuries as well as the cause of death are as under:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Remark</i>	<i>Injury Number</i>
1.	<i>A Lacerated Wound of 0.9 X 0.6 CM Present on the inner aspect of lower Lip, 3 CM away from the Premolar Area. On dissection infiltration of Blood present.</i>	1.
2.	<i>A Lacerated wound of 0.8 X 0.5 CM present on the inner aspect of Upper Lip on the right side of Lip. On dissection infiltration of Blood present.</i>	2.
3,	<i>A Lacerated Wound of 0.8 X 0.6 CM present on the Lateral side of the lower Lip near the angle of mouth. On dissection infiltration of Blood Present.</i>	3.
4.	<i>Multiple Crescentic Reddish Brown Abrasion in an Area of 5.4 X 2.8 CM Present on the right side of the Neck with Multiple Reddish Blue Contusions Present and mouth is 6.5 CM below the floor of Chin.</i>	4.
5.	<i>Reddish Brown Abrasion of 1.2 X 1.1 CM Present on the front of right knee.</i>	5.

“Cause of Death

All the injuries are ante-mortem in nature and as a result of Blunt force. Cause of death is Asphyxia as a combined effect of smothering and Strangulation which is sufficient to cause death in ordinary course of nature.”

5. Looking at the allegations, injuries and cause of death, this Court does not find any substantial reason to extend the concession of releasing the petitioner on bail merely for the reason that his other co-



accused, namely, Gurjant Singh and Harpreet Singh have already been granted bail, as they both were attributed a lighter role and regarding Gurjant Singh, at an earlier point of time, there was cancellation report and application for discharge is stated to be pending before the trial Court. However, with the kind of evidence which is already available, this Court is neither expected nor required to observe anything on merits, more so, because it may cause prejudice to the rights of either side.

6. It is also noticed that petitioner is inside jail for the period of last more than 03 years and 08 months and out of total 20 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined till date.

7. In totality of the circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant the concession of regular bail. Consequently, present petition is dismissed. However, petition is disposed of with the observations that the trial Court would expedite its proceedings and, if any application is pending, all the application(s) be decided simultaneously and if possible, on day-to-day basis, without adhering to the unnecessary requests of the defence counsel or the Public Prosecutor. Thereupon, evidence of the sole eye witness-Karnail Singh, be recorded at the first instance by the trial Court.

7. After recording statement(s) of the material witness(s), it would be open for the petitioner to move another petition for bail before this Court.

8. With the afore-mentioned observations, petition is disposed of.

9. Let a copy of the order be forwarded to the learned trial Court and the Public Prosecutor for compliance.

2026 PHHC 072581



CRM-M-57437-2025

-5-

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

05.05.2026
SN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No