



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

111

CRM-M-57564-2025
Decided on : 06.05.2026

NACHHTAR SINGHPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Rishu Garg, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Nachhatar Singh, aged about 32 years	171	15.12.2024	103(1), 238, 3(5) of BNS and section 27 of NDPS Act	Nathana	Bathinda

2. FIR in the present case was registered by complainant namely Mela Singh, stating therein, as under:-

“I am a resident of the above-mentioned village and I work as a labourer. I have 2 sons and a daughter. My elder son Baljinder Singh alias Labhi age is about 18 years then from him younger daughter Mehakpreet Kaur age is about 15 years and the youngest son



Sukhvir Singh age is about 11 years. My son Baljinder Singh alias Labhi who was working as an aluminum worker at Bhucho Mandi with Amritpal Singh son of Makhan Singh resident of Gill Khurd. On 02/12/2024, my son Baljinder Singh alias Labhi came from home telling to go to his maternal grandfather's village Masita, but we later came to know that he did not go to his maternal grandfather's village. We also came to know that he has acquaintance with Meenakshi Bhatti wife of Gurpreetpal Singh Bhatti, resident of Kapurthala, presently residing at Chak Bakhtu Road, Phatak Bhucho Mandi. My son was addicted to drugs and often used to come and go to Meenakshi Bhatti's house at Bhucho Mandi. My son Baljinder Singh alias Labhi did not come home after 02/12/2024. Today we came to know that Meenakshi Bhatti along with her other associates has murdered our son Baljinder Singh alias Labhi. And his body is buried in a secluded place behind her house so that action should be taken against Meenakshi Bhatti and her unknown associates. The statement has been recorded with you, heard it and is correct. LTI/- Mela Singh.”

3. As per the allegations, complainant's son, namely Baljinder Singh alias Labhi (since deceased), aged 18 years, was working as an aluminium worker at Bhucho Mandi with one Amritpal Singh. On 02.12.2024, Baljinder Singh alias Labhi left his home stating that he was going to his maternal grandfather's village, Masita. However, upon inquiry conducted by the complainant, it was revealed that instead of going to the said village, he had gone to accused Meenakshi Bhatti, resident of Kapurthala.

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that it is admitted in the FIR that complainant's son was already addicted to drugs. Therefore, present case has been registered merely on the basis of assumptions, without there being any direct evidence. It is further submitted that although the deceased had left home on 02.12.2024, but FIR was registered after a considerable delay on 15.12.2024.



5. Counsel further submits that name of the petitioner is neither mentioned in the FIR nor any suspicion has been raised against him by the complainant. Petitioner has been implicated in the present case solely on the basis of a disclosure statement made by co-accused Meenakshi Bhatti, pursuant to which he was arrested on 17.12.2024.

It is also submitted that apart from a general and unsubstantiated allegation that petitioner assisted the main accused-Meenakshi Bhatti, and one Yadwinder Singh in concealing the dead body of the complainant's son, no other incriminating material has surfaced during the course of investigation. Thus, counsel prays for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in the present case.

6. In response to the arguments addressed by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned State counsel, produces the custody certificate dated 05.05.2026 in Court today, which is taken on record. Office to tag the same at appropriate place. A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioner.

As per the custody certificate, in the present case, petitioner has already undergone 01 year 04 months and 13 days period inside jail.

7. Learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that as per the disclosure statement of co-accused Meenakshi Bhatti, complainant's son (since deceased) was administered an overdose of chitta/heroin, which resulted in his death. Thereafter, the dead body was buried in the plot adjacent to the house of the main accused-Meenakshi



Bhatti. Thus, it is contended that petitioner does not deserve the concession of bail.

8. This Court has heard the submissions addressed by learned counsel for the parties and has also perused the record available before it.

9. Admittedly, the case rests upon circumstantial evidence. Even if the allegations are taken at their face value, no motive has been attributed to the petitioner by the State during the course of hearing for committing the murder of the complainant's son. Furthermore, even if the allegation regarding assisting in the burial of the dead body is taken into consideration, the same, by itself, is insufficient to conclude that petitioner either committed the murder or participated in the killing of the complainant's son.

The said allegation would ultimately depend upon the nature and quality of evidence to be led by the prosecution, which must establish the charges beyond reasonable doubt before the trial Court. Petitioner has remained in custody for approximately one year and four months. Considering the nature of allegations, continued incarceration for an indefinite period is not warranted.

10. In view of the totality of circumstances, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here above, this Court deems it appropriate to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. 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/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, 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.

13. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

14. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

06.05.2026
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO