



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-45319-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 25.08.2025

Bhupinder Singh @ Bhinda

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Ms. Harmeet Kaur Chanan, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in FIR bearing No.48 dated 02.09.2024, registered under Section 103 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Bhaini Mian Khan, District Gurdaspur.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that FIR in question had been registered on the statement of Udayvir Singh pertaining to a blind murder. She submits that once Amandeep Singh was arrested by the Police and on his disclosure, the petitioner had been roped as an accused in the present case. She contends that the petitioner was arrested on 16.02.2025, however, no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from him. She further contends that other than the disclosure of the co-accused/Amandeep Singh, there is no evidence against the petitioner in



the commission of the aforesaid offence and that there is no real motive that has actually been established by the respondents despite completion of the investigation. It is contended that the said co-accused/Amandeep Singh has already been granted regular bail by the District and Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur vide order dated 27.01.2025. She contends that even though the investigation is completed and the challan stands presented on 12.05.2025, however, no evidence has been recorded so far and the trial is likely to take long time in its conclusion.

3. She further submits that although the petitioner had been involved earlier in some minor offences, however, there is no history of the petitioner being involved in any heinous offence.

4. Learned State counsel on the other hand submits that even though as per the FIR, no person has been specifically named in the FIR, however, one Amandeep Singh son of Sh. Sarabjit Singh was nominated as an accused and he was arrested on 13.12.2024 and during interrogation he disclosed that on 01.09.2024, he alongwith petitioner consumed *Golgappas* on the *rehri* of the deceased and when the money was demanded for the same, the petitioner gave *datar* blow on the head of the vendor, who died at the spot and that some drops of blood had fallen on his clothes too. Learned State counsel is however is not in a position to dispute that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner and that no witness has been examined so far.

5. It is submitted that an extra-judicial confession had been recorded before the Jagtar Singh, Ex.-Sarpanch during investigation wherein



the petitioner confessed of having committed the offence. He however does not dispute that co-accused has already been released on regular bail by the District and Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur vide order dated 27.01.2025.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the respective parties and taking into consideration the facts noticed above including the stage of the trial, the absence of recovery of any nature as well as the nature of evidence, and that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is **allowed** and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate concerned with an undertaking to the effect that he shall not indulge in any other criminal activity and shall maintain peace for a period of one year from the date of submission of the bail bonds.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE

25.08.2025

Mangal Singh

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