



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

329

CRM-M-23869-2026

Date of decision: 23.07.2026

HASANPREET SINGH @ MONTI

...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRAPresent: Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Additional AG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.380 dated 06.10.2025, under Section 103(1) Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (Corresponding Section 302 of IPC), registered at Police Station City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad (Annexure P-1).

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant-Komal Kaur, alleging therein that on 06.10.2025, she along with her brother Hasanpreet Singh (*petitioner herein*) and sister Ramandeep Kaur @ Raman was present in her house at about 12:30 PM on hearing some scream, she rushed inside the room and found the petitioner while striking blows with a wooden stick on her sister Ramandeep Kaur @ Raman. She had fallen on the floor and blood was oozing out of her head. On clamour being raised, several persons from the



neighborhood reached there. The injured was rushed to hospital. The petitioner fled from the house in the meanwhile. The victim had been declared to be brought dead, when taken to hospital. By alleging that her sister had died at the hands of the petitioner, she prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Postmortem examination of dead body of the victim was conducted. The petitioner was arrested on 07.10.2025; his blood stained clothing was recovered. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement to the effect that he was offended with the victim as he suspected that she used to talk with some other man on phone and had assaulted her to teach a lesson to her. In pursuance of his disclosure statement, he demarcated the place of occurrence and got recovered the wooden stick and brick piece used by him for inflicted injuries on her persons. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He is in custody since long. The complainant and other material witnesses have since been examined and have not implicated him in commission of the subject crime. No motive whatsoever has been attributed to him to commit murder of his sister. The trial will take considerable time to conclude as only 08 out of 23 prosecution witnesses, have been examined so far. No useful purpose would be served by his further incarceration. His antecedents are clean. With these broad submissions, it is urged that he deserves to be released on bail.

5. *Per contra* learned State counsel has argued that taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner,



he does not deserve to be extended benefit of bail.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length and have gone through the record carefully.

7. The petitioner is alleged to have caused death of his own sister on 06.10.2025. The complainant-Komal Kaur who was an eye witness as well as sister of the petitioner/deceased, has since been examined. Copy of her sworn deposition has been placed on record as Annexure P-6 and a perusal of the same reveals that she did not implicate the petitioner in commission of offence of murder of the victim. Copy of statement of PW-2 Ranjit Singh, father of the victim has also been placed on record which is to the similar effect. Taking into consideration the nature of the evidence which has come on record in the form of testimony of the complainant who was the only eye-witness to the occurrence, the period of incarceration of the petitioner, the fact that the chances of conclusion of trial in near future are bleak and the attendant facts and circumstances. The Court is of the considered opinion, the petition deserves to be allowed. Hence the same is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to his furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned.

8. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

23.07.2026

pry 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned
2. Whether reportable

: Yes / No
: Yes / No