



CRM-M-10482-2024

-1-

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

**CRM-M-10482-2024**

Date of Decision: 28.08.2025

Laddi Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Ms. Kamaldeep Kaur, Legal Aid Counsel, for the petitioner.

Mr.Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner has approached by way of filing the present petition praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.84 dated 20.09.2022 under Sections 302, 201 IPC, registered at Police Station Sarai Amant Kahn, District Tarn Taran.

2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Satish Kumar. It was alleged that Rajbir (deceased) was his younger brother. The complainant, Rajbir and Rajinder Kumar were residing in village Mahal from the last 20 years. His brother Rajbir used to live with his wife Komal, his son and daughter. On 04.09.2022, at 10:00 a.m., Rajbir went for his work, however, he did not return. On 05.09.2022, a missing report was lodged in Kambow Police Station. Thereafter, he received an information that a dead body resembling to his brother has been found. He went to the Police Station and identified the body of his brother. It was alleged that Laddi Singh (petitioner) was a friend of his brother Rajbir Singh and used to keep an evil eye on his Bhabhi Komal. He suspected that his brother Rajbir has been murdered by Laddi Singh. Request was made to take legal action against him. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 21.09.2022. He approached the Court of learned Sessions Judge,



Tarn Taran praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 12.09.2024. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of suspicion alone. She has submitted that admittedly, the case of the prosecution is based on the circumstantial evidence. She submits that dead body of brother of the complainant was found and the petitioner was implicated in this case on the frivolous allegation that he had relationship with the wife of the deceased. She submits that during the investigation, the Investigating Agency have not been able to produce even a single evidence regarding the complicity of the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner is behind bars from the last about three years, however, the trial is not concluded till date. She, thus, submits that false implication of the petitioner is writ large and thus, he deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that name of the petitioner was mentioned in the FIR itself. The petitioner had a strong motive as he had illicit relationship with the wife of the deceased. He submits that during the investigation, a *Parna* was recovered from the petitioner and the deceased was strangled with the same. On instructions, he has submitted that out of 17 prosecution witnesses, 14 witnesses have been examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the



petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the case of the prosecution is based purely based on the circumstantial evidence. As submitted before this Court, there is a recovery of *Parna* from the petitioner and 14 witnesses have been examined out of 17 prosecution witnesses. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 years, 11 months & 02 days as on 25.08.2025. It further shows that the petitioner has been shown to be involved in one more FIR, which pertains to the year 2013.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**28.08.2025**

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No