



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

238

CRM-M-11300 of 2025
Date of decision: 21.07.2025

Charandeep Singh @ Deep

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate, with
Mr. Nandan Jindal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kamal Preet Bawa, DAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 BNSS in case FIR No.78 dated 20.03.2022, under Sections 346 IPC (Sections 302 and 120-B IPC added later on), registered at Police Station City Kharar, District SAS Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the case of the prosecution is that body of the wife of the petitioner was recovered from the water channel in the Village Rai Majra. Thereafter, it was cremated by the police as unclaimed body and later Section 174 Cr.P.C. proceedings were carried out in accordance with law. However, later on the prosecution has alleged that the present petitioner strangled his wife and had thrown her body in the canal.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits petitioner was falsely implicated in the present case and there is no corroborative evidence since the post mortem has been conducted. Moreover, out of 26 witness, only 6 have been examined so far. He further submits petitioner is in



custody for the last 3 years, 3 months and 10 days as under trial. Trial is likely to take time for its conclusion and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Kamal Preet Bawa, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Learned State counsel vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. He has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate, the petitioner is in custody for the last 03 years and 03 days and 10 days.

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

7. In view of the above submissions of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that he is not involved in any other case; out of total 26 prosecution witnesses, only 6 have been examined so far; the continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, 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 her furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner misuses the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of their bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

21.07.2025

anil

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