



CRM-M-15305-2025,
CRM-M-3917-2025 (O&M),
CRM-M-4282-2025,
CRM-M-3518-2025 &
CRM-M-13767-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206+207

CRM-M-15305-2025
DATE OF DECISION :- 28.04.2025

Babar Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CRM-M-3917-2025 (O&M)

Shruti Kumari and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CRM-M-4282-2025

Lakhwinder Singh @ Mani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CRM-M-3518-2025

Amrik Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent



CRM-M-15305-2025, 2
CRM-M-3917-2025 (O&M),
CRM-M-4282-2025,
CRM-M-3518-2025 &
CRM-M-13767-2025

CRM-M-13767-2025

Rajvir Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Rishab Bhandari, Advocate with Ms. Deepika Sharma
and Mr. Manik Mehta, Advocates for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Jasjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate for the complainant.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J (ORAL)

Short replies in CRM-M-15305-2025 and CRM-M-13767-2025
have been filed in the Court today which are taken on record.

1. All the five petitions are taken up together for final disposal as these are arising out of the same FIR.
2. The present five petitions are filed under Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure (Section 482 of BNSS) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in FIR No.153 dated 10.12.2024, under Sections 80, 85, 3(5) of BNS Act, registered at Police Station Dehlon, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana, Punjab on the basis of statement made by the complainant alleging that her daughter was married to one Tejindervir Singh and no child was born out of the wedlock. After marriage, the mother-in-law of deceased, her daughter, one maid working in the house and some other relatives etc. started to mentally torture her on one pretext or the other. Allegation were also made pertaining to entrusting of some gold rings, ear rings and some other ornaments at the time of marriage. Thereafter on 20.11.2024, the in-laws and her daughter had beaten her and turned her out of the



CRM-M-15305-2025, 3
CRM-M-3917-2025 (O&M),
CRM-M-4282-2025,
CRM-M-3518-2025 &
CRM-M-13767-2025

house. Thereafter the matter was tried to be resolved but was not resolved despite various Panchayats being convened. Thereafter on 06.12.2024, the daughter of the complainant consumed some first aid tablets after which her condition deteriorated and she died.

3. The petitioner Amrik Singh in CRM-M-3518-2025 is stated to be cousin of the husband of the deceased and is stated to be living separately from his cousin. Petitioner Babar Singh in CRM-M-15305-2025 is also stated to be cousin of the husband of the deceased. Petitioner Lakhwinder Singh @ Mani in CRM-M-4282-2025 is also stated to be cousin of husband of deceased. Petitioner Shruti Kumari in CRM-M-3917-2025 is stated to be maid working in the house against whom allegations were made that she had illicit relationship with the husband of the deceased. In the petition of petitioner Shruti Kumari in CRM-M-3917-2025 the parents are also petitioners No. 2 and 3. Petitioner Rajvir Kaur in CRM-M-13767-2025 is stated to be mother-in-law of the deceased.

4. So far as the aforesaid first three petitioners are concerned, they are stated to be cousins who were named in the FIR and as per learned counsel for the petitioners they were arraigned by virtue of the fact that they are distant relatives and they have been falsely implicated. So far as petitioner Shruti Kumari is concerned, as per the complainant she had illicit relationship with the husband of the deceased and that was one of the causes of death of the daughter of the complainant. It was however, a case of the petitioner in Shruti Kumari's case that rather as per Annexure P-7 of the petition the relationship of the petitioner Shruti Kumari with the husband of the deceased was that of brother and sister as is clear from the photographs in which Rakhi was tied in the presence of the deceased and therefore allegations of illicit relationship is totally false. Petitioner Rajvir Kaur is stated to be



CRM-M-15305-2025,
CRM-M-3917-2025 (O&M),
CRM-M-4282-2025,
CRM-M-3518-2025 &
CRM-M-13767-2025

mother-in-law of the deceased. As per the complainant she was also instrumental in maltreating the deceased but as per the counsel for the petitioners she has been arraigned as an accused only by virtue of the mother of the husband of deceased and there is no direct allegation against petitioner Rajvir Kaur.

5. In all the aforesaid five cases there was stay of the arrest of the petitioners at the time of issuance of notice of motion. Today, learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Ranjit Singh has submitted that all the petitioners in five petitions have joined the investigation and they have cooperated with the investigation process. However, some of the dowry articles in the nature of gold items have not been returned, as per the complainant.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the complainant has submitted that he has objections with regard to the bail petition filed by the mother-in-law namely Rajvir Kaur to the extent that she had direct role to play in the death of her daughter because she had been raising demands of dowry and had also been instrumental in causing injuries to the deceased in a prior incident in which the matter had gone to the police also and therefore she does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail but he does not have any serious objections with regard to the remaining co-accused.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

8. Out of the aforesaid seven petitioners in five petitions, learned counsel for the complainant has also submitted that he does not have any serious objections against the six petitioners namely Babar Singh, Lakhwinder Singh @ Mani, Amrik Singh, Shruti Kumari, Harsh Vardhan and Shweta Kumari but he has serious objections with regard to anticipatory bail claimed by the mother-in-law namely Rajvir Kaur.



CRM-M-15305-2025,
CRM-M-3917-2025 (O&M),
CRM-M-4282-2025,
CRM-M-3518-2025 &
CRM-M-13767-2025

9. Learned State counsel has also stated that all the seven petitioners have joined the investigation and they have fully cooperated with the investigation process except that some gold dowry items have not been returned.

10. So far as the issue with regard to non return of some of gold items is concerned, this Court is of the considered view that the same cannot become a sole ground for denial of anticipatory bail because those are allegations which can only be seen at the time of trial by way of adducing evidence and liberty of an individual cannot be curtailed because of that reason. More so, husband of the deceased namely Tejindervir Singh is not a petitioner in any of the five cases. Therefore, so far as the aforesaid six petitioners are concerned in the facts and circumstances as per the stand taken by learned counsel for the parties the present four petitions deserves to succeed. So far as the petitioner Rajvir Kaur, who is mother-in-law of the deceased is concerned, it has been so stated by learned State counsel as well that the petitioner has joined the investigation and she has cooperated with the investigation process except for returning of gold ornaments. However, objection was taken by learned counsel for the complainant by arguing that she was instrumental in causing death of deceased who is her daughter. The petitioner Rajvir Kaur is also stated to be a lady of the age of 61 years and as per learned State counsel she has also joined the investigation and has cooperated with the investigation process except for returning of some gold items. Allegations were made against her that she has beaten up the daughter of the complainant and turned her out of the house. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the petitioner namely Rajvir Kaur, who is a lady of 61 years, this Court has to strike a balance between the liberty of an individual who is lady of the age of 61 years on the one hand and the aforesaid allegations made by the complainant regarding her



CRM-M-15305-2025, **6**
CRM-M-3917-2025 (O&M),
CRM-M-4282-2025,
CRM-M-3518-2025 &
CRM-M-13767-2025

role. For the purpose of striking balance, this Court is of a considered view that considering the petitioner being a lady and of 61 years and the fact that in pursuance of the order by which her arrest was stayed she had joined the investigation, her liberty would have an upper edge over the alleged role in the facts and circumstances of the present case and therefore this Court is of the view that even for the petitioner Rajvir Kaur she is also entitled for the grant of anticipatory bail.

11. In view of the above, all the five petitions are allowed. It is directed that the petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as and when called to do so and in the event of arrest, the petitioners shall be released on bail by the Arresting/Investigating Officer on their furnishing bail bonds/sureties to his satisfaction, subject to the conditions as provided under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C/ 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

12. All pending applications (if any) shall also stand disposed of.

13. However, anything observed hereinabove shall not be treated as an expression of opinion on merits of the case and is meant for the purpose of deciding the present petition only.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

28.04.2025
P.Singh

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