

2026:PHHC:016735



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

221

CRM-M-69824-2025
Date of Decision: 04.02.2026

**HARMESH SINGH @ MESI @ RAMESH CHAND @
RAMESH SINGH**

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Yagsimant Attri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.119 dated 01.06.2024 under Sections 302, 148, 149 and 120-B of IPC registered at Police Station Patran, District Patiala, Punjab.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the present case has been registered on the statement of one Sunita Devi wife of late Megha Singh, who claims that earlier a case was registered on the basis of statement of her husband Megha Singh against Davinder Sigh, Jeet Singh and Meeto at Police Station Patran, due to which they had a grudge against Megha Singh and started conspiring to kill him. It is further alleged that on 31.05.2024 at about 11:00 AM, she received a call from some unknown persons that Megha Singh was lying in the fields of village Badalgarh with cuts on his body. It was a blind murder. Later on, the petitioner has also been

named in the present case alongwith his other co-accused persons and he was arrested in the present case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are totally false and concocted. The petitioner has taken the plea of alibi by stating that at the time of alleged occurrence, the petitioner was not present at the spot, rather he was present in the Court at Samana, where charges were framed against him in another FIR. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 05 months and 18 days. It is further stated that the trial against the petitioner is yet to commence and as such, the same will take a long time to conclude.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab accepts notice and vehemently opposes the petition for grant of bail on the ground that the allegations and role attributed to the present petitioner in the commission of the alleged offence are serious. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. However, he could not refute the fact that on the day of alleged occurrence, the petitioner was present in the Court premises at Samana, which fact has been duly verified by him pursuant to the order of this Court passed on 13.01.2026. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 05 months and 18 days.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 05 months and 18 days and the trial will take a long time to conclude, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner deserves the concession of regular bail. Moreover, bail

is rule and jail is exception. Since the continuous incarceration of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, he is entitled to regular bail during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

9. It is clarified that if while on bail so granted through the instant order, the petitioner is found indulging in any other criminal case/activity, it shall be open to the State to seek cancellation of his bail.

10. Nothing discussed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

FEBRUARY 04, 2026.
Rajender

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

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