



**209**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT**  
**CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-40709-2024(O&M)**  
**Date of Decision: 29.04.2025**

**Jagdeep Singh**

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

**State of Punjab**

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr. B.S. Randhawa, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr.P.S. Bhandari, AAG. Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 439 of Cr.P.C for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.78 dated 23.06.2024, under Sections 498-A and 304-B of IPC, registered at Sri Anandpur Sahib, District Rupnagar.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that it is a case where the petitioner is in custody for 9 months and 13 days and all the material witnesses have been examined in the present case. He submitted that the allegations against the petitioner were that he being the husband of the deceased was of the knowledge that his parents had been harassing the deceased but even as per the FIR, the petitioner used to stay out of the house for his job of Pocklain Machine Operator. He submitted that in fact it was a case of love marriage between the petitioner and the deceased and before marriage they were in relationship for four years and after about



after about five months of the marriage his wife had died by asphyxia. He submitted that in fact the wife of the petitioner was suffering from depression since childhood regarding which when the trial commenced, then the complainant who is the father of the deceased had also deposed before the Court in this regard that his daughter who is the deceased was suffering from depression since childhood and has not supported the prosecution version and rather has been declared as hostile. Similarly no other prosecution witness has supported the prosecution version and therefore, it was not a case which could attract the provisions of Section 304-B IPC. He submitted that considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petitioner may be considered for the grant of regular bail.

3. On the other hand, Mr.P.S. Bhandari, learned AAG, Punjab appearing on behalf of the State of Punjab submitted that so far as the custody of the petitioner is concerned, the same is correct and it is also correct that the complainant and other material witnesses have not supported the prosecution version.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

5. It is a case where the petitioner is in custody for 9 months and 13 days and as per the learned counsels for the parties, all the material witnesses have been examined. Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the statement of the father of the complainant who is the author of the FIR in which he has not supported the prosecution version. Furthermore, it is not the case of the State counsel that in case the petitioner is released on bail, then he may influence the remaining witnesses or may tamper with evidence or may flee from justice.



6. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court deems it fit and proper to grant regular bail to the petitioner.

7. Consequently, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner shall be released on regular bail subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is meant for the purpose of deciding the present petition only.

**29.04.2025**

*rakesh*

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)**

**JUDGE**

Whether speaking

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No