



2026:PHHC:044285

CRM-M-66999-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-60697-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-64159-2025 (O&M)

1

119 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:044285



Date of Decision: 20.03.2026

1. CRM-M-66999-2025 (O&M)

HARPREET SINGH		... PETITIONER
	VERSUS	
STATE OF PUNJAB		... RESPONDENT

2. CRM-M-60697-2025 (O&M)

SUKHRAJ KAUR		... PETITIONER
	VERSUS	
STATE OF PUNJAB		... RESPONDENT

3. CRM-M-64159-2025 (O&M)

SUKHWINDER KAUR		... PETITIONER
	VERSUS	
STATE OF PUNJAB		... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Gurjant Singh Bhullar, Advocate for the petitioners
in CRM-M-66999-2025 and CRM-M-60697-2025.
Mr. Satnam Singh, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRM-M-64159-2025.
Mr. Rishabh Singla, A.A.G., Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. By this common order all the petitions mentioned above are
being disposed of as common FIR is involved in these petitions.

2. The petitioners are seeking regular bail under Section 483 of the
Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) in FIR No.76 dated 04.07.2025
registered under Sections 103(1)/3(5)/61/190/238 BNS, 2023 and Sections
25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959, at Police Station Mehta, District Amritsar



CRM-M-66999-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-60697-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-64159-2025 (O&M)

Rural.

3. The case of the prosecution is that FIR has been lodged on the basis of statement made by complainant Sarabjit Kaur that three unknown persons had murdered his son Jugraj Singh by firing upon him, thereafter, a supplementary statement was got recorded on 05.07.2025, wherein the complainant stated that Gurwinder Singh Bholla and Navtej Singh @ Tej had shot her son dead. Thereafter, again on 07.07.2025 another supplementary statement was recorded by the complainant alleging that Sukhraj Kaur, Sukhwinder Kaur, Harpreet Singh (petitioners) and Gurmail Singh @ Raju had conspired to kill her son. Thereafter, on 16.07.2025, she again suffered a statement to the effect that one Karan Pathak and Jatin along with some unknown persons had killed her son.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. The complainant has come up with three different versions. No active role has been attributed to the petitioner and he has been implicated in this case with the aid of Section 61/190 BNS. Moreover, Karan Pathak who was a gangster has already been killed in an encounter by the Punjab Police on 17.01.2026. He further submits that the petitioners are in custody for the last more than 08 months and are not involved in any other case. He, thus, pray for grant of bail to the petitioners.

5. Learned State counsel vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioners on the ground of gravity of allegations. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificates in Court, which are taken on record. He further submits that as per the custody certificates, the petitioners are in custody for the last more than 08 months and out of total 28 prosecution



CRM-M-66999-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-60697-2025 (O&M)
CRM-M-64159-2025 (O&M)

3

witnesses, none has been examined so far.

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

7. After hearing the rival contentions of the learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case that the complainant has come up with three different versions, however, none of them is supported by any corroborative evidence; the petitioners are in custody for the last more than 08 months; they are not involved in any other case; challan has been presented and charges are yet to be framed; out of total 28 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far; the conclusion of trial is likely to take a long time and continuous detention of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice, this Court has no option but to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners during the pendency of the trial. Moreover, *'bail is rule and jail is exception'*.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petitions are allowed. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on their furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.

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

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

20.03.2026

Janki

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