



CRM-M-390-2026

1

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

215

CRM-M-390-2026

Date of Decision: 15.01.2026

Bhupinder Nagpal @ Tinka

... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Lakshay Bector , Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P. S. Pandher, AAG., Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 483 Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking regular bail for the petitioner in case FIR No.96 dated 09.09.2022 under Sections 306 IPC registered at Police Station Division No.4, Ludhiana.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and co-accused lured the deceased (husband of the complainant namely Amit Kumar) to invest in a business and promised to share profits. The petitioner kept his promise and paid Rs.10,000/- each for four months to the complainant but later stopped doing the same. Thereafter the accused threatened to kill the deceased- husband of the complainant due to which he committed suicide by hanging himself.

3. Leaned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's name surfaced in a suicide note which was produced after a delay of 2 years 03 months and 16 days as the petitioner had

**CRM-M-390-2026****2**

financial transactions with the deceased. He further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. Moreover, the petitioner has already undergone a custody of 2 years 03 months and 16 days. It is also submitted that out of total 21 witness only two have been examined so far.

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 there is an active role of the petitioner in the commission of the offence in question. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the present petition. Custody certificate filed by the State Counsel is taken on record. As per the said certificate, the petitioner has already undergone a period of 2 years 03 months and 16 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 02 years 03 months and 16 days and the trial against the petitioner might 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, this Court deems it fit to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioner 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 indulged 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.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

JANUARY 15, 2026.
archana

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