



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

111

CRM-M-62622-2025.

Date of Decision: 08.04.2026.

Satish Kumar

....Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Punjab

....Respondent.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-Satish Kumar has filed this 2nd petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, seeking regular bail in case FIR No.38 dated 14.07.2022 under Section 302 IPC, registered at Police Station Jaurkian, District Mansa.

2. Allegation against the petitioner is that he has killed his wife and marriage between the two has taken more than 17 years back.

3. Counsel for the petitioner argues that except of bald allegation, the petitioner was related as husband and used to fight with deceased-Meenu Rani, there is substantive or collective evidence connecting to the incident. Moreover, the petitioner is the sole accused and complainant-Mithu Ram (father of the deceased) already stands partially examined. Concern of the counsel for the petitioner is that despite the incarceration period of inside jail for more than 03 years and 08 months, complete statement of even not a single witness has been recorded out of total 24 prosecution witnesses. By

referring to the zimni orders, counsel for the petitioner contends that the proceedings are deferred on all the dates despite there being no fault on the part of the petitioner. Even many a times, jail authorities have failed to produce the petitioner before the Court. Zimni order dated 15.09.2025 reflects that the instrument required to play DVR was not available.

4. Learned Senior Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, also refers to zimni order dated 06.10.2025 and submits that it was the problem of the protected password that the DVR could not be opened to play the video. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, this exercise is in process for a period of two years and unnecessarily the petitioner is facing consequences as trial even could not move ahead.

5. I have considered the submissions of the respective counsel and taking a serious note of causing delay in the trial proceedings and for the reason of total failure of the State machinery, constrained with the circumstances, wherein the petitioner is inside jail for the last more than 03 years and 08 months, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the instant petition. Accordingly, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, **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/Illaq Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. 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.

7. It is further made clear that if, in future, the petitioner is found to be directly involved in similar activities, the prosecution would be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

08.04.2026
jitender

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