



258

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

CRM-M No.18436 of 2025

Date of Decision: 01.12.2025

Raghubir Singh Puri

.....Petitioner

versus

U.T., Chandigarh

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. P. S. Ahluwalia, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Keerat Dhillon, Advocate and
Mr. Parvez Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, PP, UT, Chandigarh.

Mr. Ketan Chopra, Advocate
for the complainant.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed praying for the grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.71, dated 06.09.2021, under Sections 302, 328, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Sector 49, Chandigarh.

2. Succinctly the facts of the case are that FIR in the present case was got registered on the statement of complainant, namely, Navneet Dhillon, w/o late Sh. Brijesh Negi. It was alleged that she was residing in H. No.2876, Sector 40-C, Chandigarh and working as Professor in Fine Arts College, Sector 10, Chandigarh and his husband was in the profession



of property sale/purchase in association with Mr. Raghuvir Puri (petitioner) and Mr. Sardana. It was alleged that on 04.07.2020, at about 10:00 P.M., Mr Raghubir Puri (petitioner) called her and informed that her husband, Brijesh Negi was not feeling well and was suffering from stomach pain and they are in Fortis Hospital, Mohali, Punjab and further he asked her to come there. It was alleged that within 10-15 minutes, the complainant reached the Hospital. His husband was in Emergency and he was having severe pain in his lower abdomen. It was alleged that husband of the complainant asked her that he was with Raghubir Puri (petitioner), Sardana and Goldy and having drinks in Sector-63, Chandigarh and suddenly, he felt uneasiness and the felt pain in his abdomen. It was alleged that the doctor told the complainant regarding the stone history of her husband, thereafter, the doctor informed the complainant that he had given 02 injections to her husband and took him for an ultrasound, meanwhile, Raghubir Puri (petitioner) met the complainant and told her that Dr. Rishi Sood was his relative. When the complainant rushed to the ultrasound room, she saw 02 attendants rushing her husband towards emergency room and her husband was unconscious. It was alleged that when she tried to enter the emergency room, however she was stopped by the guards. Thereafter Dr. Rishi Sood came out of emergency room and told the complainant that her husband had a sudden major heart attack and they are treating him for the same. After 10-15 minutes, the doctor again came out of the room and told the complainant that her husband has died. Viscera sample taken were sent to CFSL, Sector 36, Chandigarh and as per the report, Phosphide was detected. Thus the request was made to take legal



action against the accused and thus, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, the petitioner was arrested on 21.11.2024. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh praying for the grant of bail, however after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandigarh declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 28.03.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has vehemently contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR. He has submitted that the petitioner along with the other co-accused, namely, Rajiv Sardana was taken to Gandhi Nagar for conducting his polygraph test. He has submitted that after the polygraph test, both the petitioner and Rajiv Sardana were found to be innocent. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the polygraph test reports. He has further submitted that co-accused, namely, Kanwarjit Singh Sandhu @ Goldy and Rajeev Sardana have also been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 30.01.2025 and 01.08.2025, respectively passed in CRM-M-39608-2024 and CRM-M-39732-2025, not only on the medical ground but on merits as well. He has further submitted that the case of petitioner, it at par with that of the co-accused, who have already been granted bail by this Court. He has thus submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant however has opposed



the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has submitted that case of the petitioner is distinguishable from that of the co-accused, who are on bail, as it was a property dispute and the petitioner has a specific motive.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. He has drawn the attention of this Court to the status report filed. He has submitted that it is the petitioner, who had a strong motive, however he does not dispute the fact that the polygraph test of Rajeev Sardana was also conducted and he has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 01.08.2025. He has further submitted that other co-accused, namely, Kanwarjit Singh Sandhu @ Goldy has already been granted bail by this Court vide order dated 30.01.2025 passed in CRM-M-39608-2024 and thus, case of petitioner is at par with that of the co-accused. He, on instructions has submitted that the charges have been framed. He has produced custody certificate of the petitioner today in the Court which is taken on record.

5. The Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of his arrest, i.e. 21.11.2024. Both the petitioner and co-accused, namely, Rajiv Sardana were found to be innocent after the polygraph test. Co-accused, namely, Kanwarjit Singh Sandhu @ Goldy and Rajeev Sardana have already been granted bail by this Court vide orders dated 30.01.2025



and 01.08.2025 passed in CRM-M-39608-2024 and CRM-M-39732-2025. Custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 01 year and 10 days as on 30.11.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. As submitted by learned State counsel, charges have been framed.

7. 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.

8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail.

9. 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.

01.12.2025

rittu

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

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE