

**107+222 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-18753-2021(O&M)**

Date of Decision: 9.9.2021

Manjeet Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present: Mr. K.R. Dhawan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Nagra, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate, for the complainant.

**Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)**

**CRM-M-28626-2021**

Notice in the application.

Mr. M.S. Nagra, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the State and Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed. Section 302 IPC be added with the other Sections mentioned in the petition.

**Main case**

Present petition has been filed under Section 439 Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in FIR No.122 dated 25.10.2020 under Sections 498-A, 304-B IPC registered at Police Station City Zira, District Ferozepur.

The petitioner before this Court is the mother-in-law of the deceased Rajinder Kaur @ Romi.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner

has been falsely implicated, as no offence under Section 304-B IPC against her made out from the allegations in the FIR. He submits that the FIR in question was lodged by Gurmail Singh, the father of the deceased, wherein it has been alleged that the marriage of his daughter Rajinder Kaur @ Romi was performed with Balkar Singh @ Bannu son of Paramjeet Singh @ Pamma on 12.12.2018. The allegations in the FIR were that the in-laws were demanding Rs.3 Lacs for sending their daughter i.e. the deceased abroad. He submits that the allegations on the face of it are totally concocted. However, their daughter-in-law committed suicide on 25.10.2020. The postmortem was conducted and cause of death was opined to be asphyxia. Learned counsel submits that there are three accused i.e. husband Balkar Singh, father-in-law Paramjeet Singh @ Pamma and the present petitioner. He submits that the arrest of the father-in-law has already been stayed by this Court. So far the petitioner is concerned, she is behind bars since 26.10.2020. He submits that material witnesses have been examined and no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars.

Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner and submitted that the death in question has taken place within the two years of the marriage and the petitioner had a specific role in the offence committed, thus, she does not deserve concession of bail.

Learned State counsel has also submitted on the line of the FIR. He submits that the prosecution has in all 23 prosecution witnesses, out of which 4 prosecution witnesses have been examined. However, he submits

that the material witnesses i.e. the complainant and the brother of the deceased have already been examined.

I have learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

In the over all facts and circumstances, I find that the petitioner is mother-in-law of the deceased and she is behind bars since 26.10.2020 and material witnesses have already been examined. In view of the same, learned counsel for the petitioner has made out a case for grant for regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail 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.

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**  
**JUDGE**

**9.9.2021**  
sharmila

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether Speaking/Reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | : | Yes/No |