



CRM-M-9756-2025

1

**210 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-9756-2025****Date of Decision: 11.09.2025****RANI**

..... Petitioner

*Versus***STATE OF PUNJAB**

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. R.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG Punjab.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.92, dated 24.05.2024, registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran, under Sections 302, 201 and 34 of IPC, 1860.

2. In compliance of order dated 22.07.2025, status report by way of affidavit dated 02.09.2025 of Riputapan Singh Sandhu, PPS, Superintendent of Police-SDPO (City) Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran filed on behalf of the respondent-State is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

4. The present case was registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by Ranjit Singh son of Gurnam Singh @ Chhallo with the allegations that his father Gurnam Singh @ Chhallo is the Vice President of Gurduwara Bibi Veero Ji. On 23.05.2024, at about 11.30 AM, his father left home on his motorcycle for Amritsar. At about 1.30 PM, he tried to contact his father on his mobile phone but it was found to



be switched off. Thereafter, they inquired his whereabouts from their relatives but he could not be traced and they lodged missing person report at Anngarh Police Station at Amritsar on 24.05.2024, he received information that his father's dead body and motorcycle were lying near Kakka Kandiala railway crossing, across the road from the SR Resort Palace on which he reached the spot and found the shoes of his father as well as his mobile phone and Sri Sahib missing. From physical appearance, it appeared that he has been beaten severely and they sought action against culprits.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. The present case is based on circumstantial evidence. After two months of the occurrence, one Lovepreet Singh approached the police and claimed that petitioner has suffered extra judicial confession before him admitting having committed the crime and thereafter, petitioner was arrested on 22.07.2024. Learned counsel next contended that there is no other evidence against the petitioner except alleged extra judicial confession before one Lovepreet Singh which is a weak type of evidence. There was no motive for the petitioner to commit the crime. Nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner so as to connect her with the alleged offence. The investigation has already been completed and challan was presented and out of total 20 witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 5 witnesses have been examined till date. The decision of the trial is certainly going to take sufficiently long time to conclude and in these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and she deserves to be released on bail.



6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence in connivance with the co-accused Arshdeep and Harjit Kaur and they all had committed the murder and thereafter had thrown the dead body on the road side and he prayed that bail application of the petitioner be dismissed.

7. The present case is based on circumstantial evidence and no one had seen the occurrence take place. No one had also seen petitioner in the company of deceased immediately prior to his death. The only evidence against the petitioner is the extra judicial confession allegedly suffered before one Lovepreet Singh after two months of the incident. As to how much evidentiary value will be attached to the said extra judicial confession shall be seen during the trial which will be a moot question. Petitioner is in custody since 22.07.2024. Out of total 20 witnesses cited by the prosecution, only 5 witnesses have been examined till date. The decision of the trial is certainly going to take a sufficiently long time to conclude and in these circumstances, further detention of the petitioner is not required and she deserves to be released on bail.

8. Having regard to the aforesaid factual position, but without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the bail application is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, on usual terms and conditions.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

11.09.2025
Ali

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