



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CRM-M-68254-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 05.02.2026

Arshdeep Singh

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. This second petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.133 dated 12.06.2022, registered under Section(s) 302, 379-B, 34, 120-B, 380, 177 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Chheharta, District Amritsar.

2. Status report by way of affidavit dated 03.02.2026 on behalf of respondent(s)-State has been filed by the learned State counsel today in the Court and the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been furnished to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. FIR in the present case has been registered on the statement of Satnam Kaur, who stated that she was married to Harinder Singh in the year 2013 and two children were born out of the said wedlock. She stated that



her husband had been working in Dubai for the last 12–13 years and used to visit India periodically. On 12.06.2022, at about 3.30 a.m., she along with her husband and their two daughters was going to pay obeisance at Sri Darbar Sahib on motorcycle and when they reached Harkrishna Nagar near Dashmesh Gun House, Kale Road, two unknown persons came on a motorcycle from behind and pushed them as a result of which they fell down. One of those persons fired a gunshot at the head of her husband and also snatched her mobile phone as well as that of her husband. On her outcry, public gathered at the spot. Her injured husband was taken to the hospital where he was declared dead. On the basis of the said allegations, the instant FIR was thus registered.

4. He submits that as per the prosecution case emerging from the investigation, it has been alleged that the petitioner was having an illicit relationship with Satnam Kaur (complainant and wife of the deceased-Harinder Singh) and on her asking, the petitioner hired Varinder Singh who is stated to have fired the gunshot at the head of Harinder Singh (since deceased). He contends that the weapon used in commission of the crime allegedly belongs to the uncle of the petitioner and that the same had been stolen by the petitioner and handed over to Varinder Singh for executing the crime. The weapon in question was later recovered on the disclosure of the petitioner.

5. Counsel contends that the co-accused Satnam Kaur as well as Varinder Singh, who is alleged to have fired the fatal shot, have already been granted the concession of regular bail. It is further argued that the petitioner



has been in custody since 12.06.2022 and has already undergone an actual custody of more than 3 ½ years. He contends that only 03 out of the total 28 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude. It is also submitted that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

6. Learned counsel for respondent-State, on the other hand, contends that the petitioner is the main accused, who hired Varinder Singh to commit the murder of Harinder Singh, husband of Satnam Kaur. He contends that the petitioner was the one who facilitated the weapon from which the fatal shot was fired. Hence, his participation in the offence is well established from the circumstances including the recovery of weapon effected on the disclosure of the petitioner. He however does not dispute the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner and that he is not involved in any other criminal case. The stage of the trial is also not disputed.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the period of actual custody of more than 3 ½ years undergone by the petitioner, the clean antecedents, the fact that two co-accused, including the co-accused alleged to have fired the fatal shot, have already been granted the concession of regular bail coupled with the stage of the trial wherein only 03 witnesses out of total 28 have been examined so far and further bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is



ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned.

9. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

05.02.2026
Mangal Singh

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