

2025:PHHC:093425



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

1. **CRM M-7066-2025**
Date of Decision:25.07.2025

Baljit Kaur ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

2. **CRM M-6952-2025**

Gurparsad Singh @ Gora ...Petitioner
Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. P.B.S. Goraya, Advocate with
Mr. S.S. Bhullar, Advocate and
Mr. S.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM M-7066-2025.

Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM M-6952-2025.

Mr. R.S. Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nikhil Thamman, Advocate
for the complainant.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J.

1. This order shall dispose off two petitions, i.e., CRM M-7066 of 2025 titled as “***Baljit Kaur Vs. State of Punjab***”, and CRM M-6952-2025 titled as “***Gurparsad Singh @ Gora Vs. State of Punjab***”, whereby, the petitioners have prayed for grant of concession

of regular bail to them in case FIR No. 175 dated 07.11.2023 under Sections 302 and 34 IPC (offence under Section 120-B IPC added later on vide rapat No. 24 dated 07.11.2023) and Sections 25, 27, 54 and 59 of the Arms Act registered at Police Station Sadar Patti, District Tarn Taran.

2. The FIR in the present case has been registered on the basis of the statement made by Malook Singh and the same has been reproduced below:-

“Statement of Malook Singh son of Joginder Singh son of Pala Singh resident of Pati Sarhali Ghariyala Police Station Sadar District Tarn Taran aged 63 years Mobile No. 9592016071. Stated that I am a farmer and residing at above mentioned address. I have 3 children, eldest daughter Harjit Kaur is married with Gurpartap Singh resident of Bangalipur, younger son Ranjit Singh alias Rana alias Bau was married with Baljit Kaur daughter of Jugraj Singh resident of Lakhana in the year 2011. They have 2 children, daughter Samreet Kaur is 11 year old and son Agamdeep Singh is 8 year old. My youngest daughter Baljit Kaur is married with Yadwinder Singh resident of Daburji. In the year 2016 my son Ranjit Singh alias Rana had gone to Qatar and in the month of May 2023 he had come back to village and he opened up Gym at bus stand Ghariyala. Today after having dinner, I along with my wife Shinder Kaur slept in the courtyard whereas, my son Ranjit Singh slept in the room with his wife Baljit Kaur and his two children. Around 1.20 AM, gun shots were heard from the room of my son Ranjit Singh alias Rana and after waking up, I noticed that two

young boys with a haircut running away after scaling the wall through stairs and I tried to catch them, electric bulb was on and among them, one boy was Mahabir Singh son of Gurpreet Singh resident of Lakhana who was carrying pistol in his left hand. I already knew him. At that time my daughter Baljit Kaur was standing in the courtyard. I went inside and saw that my son was lying in the courtyard with face down smeared in blood. We picked him up and put him on the cot but my son Ranjit Singh alias Rana had died due to gun shots fired by above mentioned. The motive is that my son had gone to Qatar in the year 2016 and my daughter in law Baljit Kaur wife of Ranjit Singh daughter of Jugraj Singh resident of Lakhana had developed illicit relations with Mahabir Singh. After this came in our knowledge, we told everything to girl's father Jugraj Singh son of Puran Singh resident of Lakhana and Mahabir Singh used to give threats to my son Ranjit Singh on phone. When we and our relatives talked with my daughter in law Baljit Kaur and her father Jugraj Singh son of Puran Singh resident of Lakhana regarding this then Jugraj Singh admitted the fault of his daughter and gave a written affidavit assuring that his daughter Baljit Kaur will not commit this kind of mistake in future. After leaving my elder brother Harbhajan Singh son of Joginder Singh resident of Ghariyala near dead body of my son Ranjit Singh alias Rana I along with my neighbour Tarlochan Singh son of Chanchal Singh resident of Ghariyala were going to inform you that you met us bus stand Ghariyala and I got my statement recorded before you, heard, it is correct. Action be taken. Sd/- Malook Singh.”

3. Learned counsel for Baljit Kaur (petitioner in CRM M-7066 of 2025) submits that at the time of occurrence, the petitioner herself was present at the spot and had admittedly not played any role in the occurrence. Even, her involvement in the crime was shown only on the basis of suspicion and there was no credible or reliably admissible evidence to connect her with the alleged murder of her husband Ranjit Singh @ Rana. Even, as per the complainant and another witness, two persons were seen going on a motorcycle towards the house of the deceased and, out of those, one person was identified as Mahabir Singh. Even during the course of investigation, the police could not collect any evidence to show the involvement of the petitioner in the crime. He further contends that now it is being falsely alleged that the petitioner had conspired with Mahabir Singh, main accused to commit the murder of her husband and there is no credible evidence to prove the said allegation. Even, the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 07th November 2023 and is in custody since then. Even, charge has been framed, but no prosecution witness has been examined so far.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner (Gurparsad Singh @ Gora) submits that the petitioner had no reason to participate in the occurrence in question. In fact, Mahabir Singh, main accused, who was stated to be armed with a pistol and alleged to have fired gun shot on the deceased was allegedly having illicit relations with Baljit Kaur, co-accused and due to the said enmity, he

had killed Ranjit Singh @ Rana. However, no motive has been attributed to the petitioner and he had no reason to participate in the occurrence. He further contends that in fact, Baljit Kaur, was happily married to Ranjit @ Rana since 2011 and they had two children aged about 08 and 11 years. Thus, even she had no reason to conspire with the other co-accused and the entire prosecution case is false. The petitioner was arrested on 14.11.2023 and is in custody since then.

5. During the course of arguments, learned State counsel had expressed the apprehension that the petitioner may tamper with the prosecution evidence and, at that stage, learned counsel for the petitioner voluntarily made a statement that till the examination of the complainant, the petitioner will not enter within the jurisdiction of District Tarn Taran except on the dates of hearing fixed before the trial Court. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that even from the postmortem report, it was evident that no injury was caused to Ranjit @ Rana by using a *Gandasa* and the case of the prosecution is false.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel assisted by the counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the submissions made by the petitioner on the ground that Baljit Kaur was having illicit relations with Mahabir Singh, main accused and she had conspired with him to get her husband Ranjit @ Rana eliminated. Even, still further, Gurpparsad Singh @ Gora had accompanied Mahabir Singh at the place of occurrence and was armed with a

Gandasa. Even, the *Gandasa* has been recovered from him during the course of investigation. Learned counsel further contends that the report of the FSL was earlier awaited and the petitioner had recovered the *Gandasa* used in the commission of the crime.

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

8. In the present case, Baljit Kaur and her husband Ranjit @ Rana, since deceased, were present at their home and at about 1.20 a.m., two young boys scaled the walls and out of them one boy Mahabir Singh had fired at Ranjit @ Rana. Even, Ranjit @ Rana had died due to the gun shots fired by Mahabir, non-applicant. The only allegation against Baljit Kaur, petitioner is that she had conspired with Mahabir Singh and only allegation against Gurbhag Singh @ Gora, petitioner is that he had accompanied Mahabir Singh. However, no specific role was assigned to both the petitioners. Even, the prosecution is yet to lead evidence with regard to the involvement of both the petitioners in the crime.

9. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioners shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case, so as to dissuade

him to disclose such facts to the Court or to any other authority.

(ii) The petitioners shall remain present before the Court on the dates fixed for hearing of the case.

(iii) The petitioners shall not absent themselves from the Court proceedings except on the prior permission of the Court concerned.

(iv) The petitioners shall surrender their passports, if any, (if already not surrendered), and in case they are not holder of the same, they shall swear an affidavit to that effect.

(v) The petitioners shall also file their affidavit before the concerned Court, mentioning his ordinary place of residence and number of mobile phone, which shall be used by them during the pendency of the trial. In case of change of place of residence/mobile number, they shall share the details with the concerned Court/learned Trial Court.

(vi) In case, the petitioners get involved in any other criminal activity, during the pendency of the trial, it shall be viewed seriously and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail granted to the present petitioners.

(vii) The concerned Court may insist two heavy local surties and may also impose any other condition, in accordance with law, while accepting the bails bonds and surety bonds of the petitioners.

(viii) The petitioners shall report every 1st and 3rd Monday in English calander month before the concerned SHO till the conclusion of the trial and SHO shall mark their presence by making an entry in the

Rojnamcha. In case, they do not report on every 1st and 3rd Monday before the concerned SHO, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession granted to them shall be liable to be cancelled and the State of Punjab shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application in this regard.

(xi) Gurparsad Singh @ Gora petitioner shall file an affidavit before the Court that he shall not enter the jurisdiction of District Tarn Taran till the examination of the complainant by the trial Court. However, he may come to Tarn Taran Court Complex for attending Court proceedings only on the date of hearing fixed before the trial Court.

(xi) The petitioners shall not move any application for exemption from personal appearance during the trial, so that the proceedings may be held expeditiously.

25.07.2025
amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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