



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

CRM-M-14676-2025

Date of Decision: 24.07.2025

Rajwinder Kaur

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate with
Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravneet Singh Joshi, DAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the third petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to her in case FIR No. 46, dated 22.05.2022, registered under Sections 302,201,34 of IPC, Police Station Qadian, Tehsil and District Gurdaspur (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the FIR was initially registered against unknown persons and no suspicion was raised against the petitioner. On 24.05.2022, a secret information was received by the I.O that Mandeep Singh, since deceased used to visit the house of the petitioner and it was suspected that the petitioner along with other persons had committed the murder of Mandeep Singh. Accordingly, a GD No.34 dated 24.05.2022 (Annexure P-5) was registered. Later on, the supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded on 25.05.2022, who had stated that he had come to know that the petitioner and her brother Jagdish Singh had murdered the deceased. Later on, on 30.05.2022, further supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded, wherein, he named several other family members of

the petitioner, who were found innocent. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 25.05.2022 and she is in custody for the last more than three years and two months. Learned counsel further contends that 10 witnesses out of total 20 witnesses have been examined so far and there are no chances of early conclusion of the trial. Even, the testimony of complainant has already been recorded by the Trial Court.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

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

5. In the present case, the case is based on circumstantial evidence and the name of the petitioner appeared on record after two days of the occurrence. Now, the prosecution is yet to lead evidence before the Trial Court to prove the complicity of the petitioner in the crime. The petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last about three years and two months and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

6. Without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail pending trial on his furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

24.07.2025
hitesh

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