

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:041850



118

CRM-M-61703-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision:17.03.2026

Jaspal Singh @ Jassa @ Ghub

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. A.S. Manaise, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jagpal Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. This is a petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case arising out of FIR No.92 dated 24.06.2023 initially registered under Section 346 of IPC (Sections 302, 201, 148, 149, 420 and 468 and 120-B of IPC added later on and Section 346 of IPC deleted) at Police Station Sirhind, District Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab.

2. The adumbrated facts as emanating from the record are that the aforementioned FIR was initially registered under Section 346 of IPC against unknown persons on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant-Jeevandeep Kaur, alleging therein that on 19.06.2023, her

husband Sukhjit Singh, who was addicted to liquor, had left home on his motorcycle at around 06.00 PM, while informing that he was going to bring liquor from Sirhind Liquor Vend. He did not return home that night and also did not respond to the calls made on his phone. In the next morning, she had gone to her father-in-law and they had made search for her husband, whose motorcycle was found parked on the rough track of the canal. His footwear were also lying on the bank of the canal. On making further search, his phone was found buried in the soil wrapped in a handkerchief at a distance of about 01 km from the canal bridge.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On 25.06.2024, the complainant along with her father-in-law approached the police officials informing that she had received information about some accident having taken place in the area of Police Post Basantpura Chowk on the intervening night of 19/20.06.2023 and doubted that her husband had died in the said accident. On hearing so, S.I. Amarjit Singh established contact with the in-charge of Police Post Basantpura. who disclosed that one Gurpreet Singh Cheema resident of Ramdas Nagar had died in the accident qua an FIR No.58 had been registered and also informed that after conducting postmortem examination of the dead body, the same had been handed over to the family members of the deceased. On raising suspicion, S.I. Amarjit Singh reached at the spot of the accident from where suspicious blood stained gravel and hair were collected. The photographs of the dead body were shown to the complainant, who identified the dead body to be that of her husband Sukhjit Singh.

4. As per the further allegations, the complainant Jeevandeep Kaur

then recorded a supplementary statement before the police to the effect that her deceased husband was having friendly relations with the accused Gurpreet Singh and had told the complainant that the former not only used to bring liquor for him but also used to give money to consume the same. She raised suspicion that her husband had been killed by the accused Gurpreet Singh in connivance with his wife Khushdeep Kaur and his companions which included the present petitioner and also informed that the accused Gurpreet Singh had taken out several life insurance policies of huge sums of money and by showing his death in an accident with an intent to get the claimed amount of insurance, he had made her husband unconscious by giving him liquor laced with some poisonous substance and, thereafter, crushed him to death with a truck and showed himself to be a dead. The statements of the other witnesses were also recorded. Offence under Section 346 of IPC was deleted and offences under Sections 302, 201, 148, 149 and 120-B of IPC were added. The petitioner and accused Gurpreet Singh and Khushdeep Kaur along with their unknown companions were nominated as such. During the course of investigation proceedings, the accused Gurpreet Singh and Khushdeep Kaur were arrested. They suffered disclosure statements admitting the factum of their involvement in the murder of the victim and also took the names of the petitioner and other co-accused and on the basis of same, the petitioner was also arrested on 27.06.2023. Investigation has since been completed. The petitioner along with the co-accused is facing trial for commission of aforementioned offences.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of supplementary statement

recorded by the complainant and disclosure statement of co-accused, which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. It is a case of blind murder. There is no eye witness to the murder of the victim. The case rests upon the circumstantial evidence. The petitioner had no motive to kill the victim. The mobile phone details and tower locations collected by the police do not point towards the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. He has not been in contact with the main culprits, namely, Gurpreet Singh and Khushdeep Kaur. He is in custody since long. There are no chances of conclusion of trial in near future as only 09 out of 59 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far. There is no incriminating circumstance to connect him with the commission of subject offences. His antecedents are also clean. It is, therefore, argued that he deserves to be extended the benefit of bail.

6. Per contra, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently argued that the allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature as in pursuance of a conspiracy hatched with the co-accused, he had driven a truck bearing registration No.PB-11BU-4194 on the fateful night i.e. on the intervening night of 19/20.06.2023 and had crushed the victim Sukhjit Singh by running over the said truck over his head twice so that he could not be identified. He had parked the said truck at some unknown place and had subsequently got the same recovered. Infact, he was an active participant in the crime. The victim was eliminated in a cold blooded manner. With these broad submissions, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned

counsel for the parties.

8. The petitioner is alleged to be a part of the conspiracy hatched by accused Gurpreet Singh and Khushdeep Kaur, to eliminate the victim Sukhjit Singh and to show it a case of accidental death of Gurpreet Singh by projecting the dead body which was actually of the victim/Sukhjit Singh to be that of Gurpreet Singh with an intent to get money of the insurance policies taken from the insurance companies in the name of accused Gurpreet Singh. He was the principal executor, who carried out the act of killing the victim by driving a heavy vehicle. It is he, who had driven the said truck. Recovery of the said truck was effected at his instance. He was an active participant in the occurrence. It is well settled proposition of law that mere prolonged period of custody or the fact that the trial is likely to take time by itself or coupled with the period of incarceration are not sufficient grounds for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made in ***Parmod Kumar Saxena Vs. UOI, 2008(63) ACC (SC), Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC, 242*** and ***State through CBI Vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)***.

9. Keeping in view the gravity of the allegations, the part attributed to the petitioner, the quantum of sentence for which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances of the case, this Court of the considered opinion that the no compelling ground for grant of bail is made out in favour of the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

10. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

11. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

17.03.2026

harjeet

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

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE