



In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh

CRM-M-1065-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-16.1.2025

Ranjit Kaur ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Navkiran Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Prabhdeep Singh Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Section/s
50	24.2.2020	Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran	302, 341, 120-B, 148, 149 of Indian Penal Code and Section 25, 27, 29 of Arms Act

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner seeks grant of regular bail in respect of the aforementioned FIR.
2. The FIR was lodged at the instance of Palwinder Kaur wife of Baldev Singh (deceased) wherein it is alleged that on 24.2.2020, she alongwith her husband Baldev Singh, her father Nachatar Singh and daughter Karanbir Kaur had gone to Village Jaspat to attend a marriage and when they were returning back and were walking through the fields, her brother-in-law Sukhdev Singh came there armed with a gun, who was accompanied by his sons Manjinder Singh and Amanat Singh, who were carrying pistols. Ranjit Kaur (petitioner)



CRM-M-1065-2025 (O&M)

(2)

wife of Sukhdev Singh was carrying a baseball bat. Kuldeep Singh and Kashmir Singh, who were carrying guns, were also accompanying them. Jagtar Singh, father-in-law of the complainant, who was standing nearby pointed towards Baldev Singh, upon which Sukhdev Singh and others surrounded Baldev Singh. Ranjit Kaur is stated to have given a signal upon which a 'Bolero' vehicle also came there and 8-9 unidentified persons, who were having their faces muffled, alighted from the said vehicle and who were all carrying guns and pistols. It is alleged that Ranjit Kaur (petitioner) raised a 'lalkara' exhorting her companions to catch hold of Baldev Singh and to teach him a lesson for demanding land from them and upon which, Sukhdev Singh, Amanat Singh, Manjinder Singh, Kuldeep Singh, Kashmir Singh and Hoshier Singh opened fire. It is further alleged that the unidentified persons also caught hold of Baldev Singh and dragged him while Ranjit Kaur give a blow with baseball bat to Baldev Singh. The unidentified persons hit Baldev Singh with butt of the guns. When the complainant raised alarm, the assailants fled away from the spot. Although Baldev Singh was rushed to the hospital, but was declared dead.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is a case where a large number of members of the same family have been implicated on account of a dispute over land. It has been submitted that as a matter of fact, the father-in-law of the complainant had transferred his land in favour of Sukhdev Singh, i.e. husband of the petitioner which did not go well with complainant's brother-in-law Sukhdev Singh and other members of the family and on account of which, they had been raising quarrels resulting in various other FIRs lodged against both the parties. Learned counsel submitted that, in any



CRM-M-1065-2025 (O&M)

(3)

case, even if all the allegations are taken to be correct, the only role attributed to the petitioner is that she had raised a '*lalkara*' exhorting her companions to teach Baldev Singh a lesson and that the cause of death is apparently the gun shot injuries attributed to co-accused. It has been submitted that when a large number of other accused are alleged to be carrying guns and had fired from the same, the role of the petitioner even if taken to be correct is rather insignificant and apparently she has been involved falsely. It has been submitted that the petitioner as on date has been behind bars since the last about 1 year and 3 days and that since the trial has not made any headway, further detention of the petitioner, who is a lady, would not be justified.

4. Opposing the petition, learned State counsel submitted that it is a case where the petitioner is specifically named in the FIR and since it was upon her exhortation that the co-accused opened fire, her complicity is clearly evident. It has also been informed that the petitioner happens to be involved in 1 more case for offence under Section 323 IPC. Learned State counsel informed that as on date 10 PWs out of cited 43 PWs have already been examined.
5. This Court has considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of this case particularly the fact that the petitioner is not attributed any fatal injury and only role attributed to her is that she had raised a *lalkara* and while also bearing in mind that the petitioner, who is a lady, has been behind bars for a substantial period of about 1 year and 3 days and conclusion of trial is likely to consume more time as only 10 PWs out of cited 43 PWs have been examined so far, further detention of the petitioner would not serve any useful purpose.



CRM-M-1065-2025 (O&M) (4)

7. The instant petition, as such, is accepted and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned.

16.1.2025
Geeta/P

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No