



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

234

CRM-M-24702-2025
Date of Decision: 23.09.2025

Maninder Singh**.....Petitioner**

Vs.

State of Punjab**.....Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. J. S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Satnam Singh Thakur, Advocate, for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Present second petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.258 dated 26.09.2019, under Sections 302, 34, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Line, District Patiala.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the present FIR has been got registered on the statement of complainant Sunny Singh that the petitioner was having illicit relations with another woman and, on account thereof, he used to subject his wife Poonam (sister of complainant) to cruelty and harassment. On 24.09.2019, the complainant received a telephonic call regarding the critical condition of his sister Poonam and her husband Maninder Singh, who had both been admitted to Rajindra Hospital, Patiala. The complainant, along with his father, immediately reached Rajindra Hospital, Patiala, where they found that his sister Poonam had expired. The



specific allegation against the petitioner is that he murdered his wife by inflicting injuries upon her. The petitioner approached the Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala vide order dated 04.09.2023. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing of CRM-M-25358-2024, however, the same was disposed of vide order dated 18.11.2024. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing of present second petition for grant of bail.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently submitted before this Court that petitioner is the husband of the deceased. She submits that case of the prosecution is totally based on circumstantial evidence. She submits that prosecution has relied upon the two confessional statements of the petitioner and recovery of baseball bat. She submits that the occurrence in the present case did not take place in the matrimonial home, however, the incident occurred, outside the house i.e., in an open plot. She submits that since the case of the prosecution is based on circumstantial evidence, it is the settled mandate of law that the chain of circumstances must be established beyond reasonable doubt. The petitioner in the present case has been made a prime accused only being husband of the deceased. There is not credible evidence produced by the prosecution for proving its case beyond the reasonable doubt against the petitioner. She has submitted that now there are three accused in the present case out of which, two have already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 09.05.2022 and 23.11.2022



respectively and petitioner is behind the bars since the date of his arrest i.e. 30.09.2019. She submits that petitioner has virtually completed an incarceration of about 6 years. She lays emphasis on the custody of the petitioner and *de hors* the merits of the case. The petitioner has a fundamental rights of speedy trial which has been measurably defeated in the present case. She submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and the majority of the prosecution witnesses already stands examined, hence, he deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the contentions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that petitioner does not deserve the concession to be granted bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel however, has opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that the deceased in the present case is none other than the wife of the petitioner himself. He submits that the petitioner, in pursuance of a well-hatched conspiracy, murdered his wife, namely Poonam Rani. He further submits that the petitioner was having illicit relation with another girl and thus, he had strong motive to eliminate his wife. It is submitted that during investigation it was found that relation of petitioner husband and deceased wife was not cordial since long. On instructions, he submits that out of 22 prosecution witnesses, 19 have already been examined; one of the remaining witnesses has been given up, and the other two witnesses have been partially examined. He has placed on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.



6. This Court has heard counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance. It is deciphered that the petitioner before this Court is the husband of the deceased. Admittedly the case of the prosecution is based on circumstantial evidences. As submitted before this Court, the prosecution has already examined almost all the witnesses. The custody certificate placed on record reflects that the petitioner has undergone custody for a period of 05 years, 11 months, and 18 days as on 22.09.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. This Court cannot ignore the fact that he has almost completed six years of incarceration. The aspect of custody, in itself, tilts the balance in favour of the petitioner for consideration of his prayer for grant of bail.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. 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. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

23.09.2025

anil

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned:
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No