

2025.PHHC:126387



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

**CRM-M No.2299 of 2025
Date of Decision: 15.09.2025
Reserved on: 08.09.2025**

Sukhdeep Singh @ Soni

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Ranbir Singh Sekhon, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNSS") seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
80	19.10.2023	Sadar Abohar, District Fazilka	302 and 120-B of IPC (34 of IPC added later on)

2. As per the allegations, on the night of 18.10.2023, Gurmeet Singh husband of complainant was having conversation with her brother-in-law and herself when the petitioner along with Manpreet Singh came to her house and asked her husband to accompany them towards their

2025:PHHC:126387



fields as their tractor had got stuck there. On their asking, her husband left with them. At about 11:30 PM, Manpreet Singh brought her husband home in an injured condition. His left arm was broken. He had injuries on his head and other parts of the body and blood was oozing out from the same. On asking, Gurmeet Singh told them that injuries had been caused to him by the petitioner. As his condition worsened, he was taken to Civil Hospital, was referred to some higher centre but died on the way. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The petitioner was arrested on 20.10.2023. Co-accused were also arrested. A video was recovered from the mobile of the co-accused Manpreet Singh wherein the petitioner was shown to be assaulting the victim. Investigation now stands completed.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. There is no eye-witness to the occurrence. The case is based on circumstantial evidence which is hearsay in nature. He is in custody since long. He has a permanent abode. There are no chances of his absconding or tampering with evidence. He has clean antecedents. His further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose. It is, therefore, urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. While refuting the contentions as raised by the petitioner's counsel, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab has submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious and specific in nature as he along with the co-accused had taken the victim along with him on the pretext of helping them for taking out their tractor

2025:PHHC:126387



from the fields and had assaulted him. Multiple injuries were caused to the victim. The victim was brought home by the co-accused. All the injuries have been caused with a tamba by the petitioner. The trial has commenced and is going on at a proper pace. There is nothing to show that there would be any unusual delay in conclusion thereof. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. The petitioner by hatching a conspiracy with the co-accused is alleged to have taken the victim to their fields and brutally assaulted him and caused serious injuries to him. The victim died as a result of the injuries shortly after the incident. He is shown to have disclosed about involvement of the petitioner in causing injuries to him, to his wife and such statement is to be considered as dying declaration of the victim. The trial is proceeding at a proper pace since as many as 13 witnesses stand examined. The well settled proposition of law is that mere prolonged period of custody is not sufficient ground for enlarging an accused on bail, when the offence alleged is serious. Reference in this context can be had to the observations made in *Parmod Kumar Saxena Vs. UOI, 2008(63) ACC (SC)*, *Chenna Boyanna Krishna Yadav Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2007) 1 SCC, 242* and *State through CBI Vs. Amaramani Tripathi, 2005(4) RCR (Criminal) 280(SC)*. Keeping in view the above discussed facts and circumstances but without meaning to make any comment on the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

2025:PHHC:126387



Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

15.09.2025

manju

**(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No