

CRM-M-21975-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-21975-2025
Reserved on: 01.09.2025
Pronounced on: 12.09.2025

Tejo Devi ...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Sahil Laura, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Atul Gaur, AAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
212	20.08.2023	Ismailabad, District Kurukshetra	306, 34 IPC (Section 306 IPC replaced by Section 302 IPC later on)

1. The petitioner incarcerated in the FIR captioned above came before this Court under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking regular bail.
2. In paragraph 17 of the bail petition, the accused declares that she has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“That the brief facts of the case are that on 20.08.2023, an information in the police station that one Ramandeep Kaur wife of Hakam Singh has finish her life. On receiving information ASI Daler Singh along with other police officer reached the spot, where the dead body was lying in the court yard in the house. There were marks of rope or cloth on the neck. Som Nath father of the decease was present on the spot who gave his statement alleging therein that he has two son and two daughters, all are married. The marriage of her daughter Ramandeep Kaur was solemnized with Hakam Singh alias Kalu in the year 2012 and he has given dowry more than his capacity at the time of her marriage. One boy was born out of said wedlock of his daughter and accused Hakam Singh. After two year of

CRM-M-21975-2025

marriage Ramandeep Kaur complained to him that her husband drinks liquor everyday and fight with her. Her mother-In-law Tejo Devi also fights with her. Whenever she stops her husband to drink liquor then her mother in law along with her husband say bed think to her. Many time Panchyats were convened between the party and every time on assurance that Ramandeep Kaur will be kept properly, she was brought back to her matrimonial home. However, the accused person did not ment their ways. 20-22 days ago Ramandeep Kaur had given an application in Police Station Ismaillabad District Kurukshetra against her husband for fighting with her after drinking liquor. Again Panchyat was convened and her husband felt sorry from them and took his daughter back on the assurance that they will not fight with her again. He also assured that he will not stop Ramandeep Kaur for working and will not make wrong allegations against her. Now 4-5 ago again Ramandeep Kaur told them that her husband has started drinking liquor and again making allegations against character. They assured that they will convene a Panchayat again and his husband will understand. Today at about 12.30 midnight his maternal grandson Jaspreet Singh alias Jassu called them and informed that his mother has expired. On receiving this information he with the other persons reached there and found the dead body in the court yard of the house. Then they checked the dead body and found a rope mark on her neck. She was not kept properly by her husband and mother-in-law and therefore she has committed Suicide due to their act and conduct.”

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that further pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

“There are seven injuries mentioned in the postmortem report and after taking opinion of the concerned doctor, Section 306 IPC was deleted and Section 302 IPC was added in the present case.”

REASONING:

7. An analysis of the investigation conducted so far points out two aspects. Firstly, that the cause of death as per the doctor, was not suicide but homicide. Secondly that the petitioner was last seen at the spot and she has not explained her role in the entire occurrence, this Court cannot presume the absence of motive given the past allegations against the petitioner levelled by the complainant and his family members. Furthermore,

CRM-M-21975-2025

the investigation has also found the petitioner's involvement and recovery of dupatta which was used in the commission of crime.

8. Even earlier, the petitioner had come up before this Court seeking regular bail almost on identical grounds and this Court had rejected the bail by passing a detailed order dated 30.08.2024 in CRM-M-13129-2024. No new circumstances have been brought to this Court's notice and as such, even on the ground of dismissal of the earlier bail petition on merits, the present successive petition would otherwise also not be maintainable.

9. A perusal of the bail petition and the documents attached prima facie points towards the petitioner's involvement and does not make out a case for bail. The impact of crime would not justify bail. Any further discussions will likely prejudice the petitioner; this court refrains from doing so.

10. The petitioner's custody of around 02 years cannot be termed prolonged, given the minimum sentence prescribed for the offense.

11. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

12. **Petition dismissed.** All pending applications, if any, are disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

12.09.2025
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.