



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

03

**CRM-M-22827-2025
Reserved on: 07.11.2025
Pronounced on : 17.11.2025**

HARJEET KAUR

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by: Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasdev Singh Thind, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. For the commission of offence punishable under Sections 103(1), of BNS 2023 & Section 27 of Arms Act [Section 61(2) of BNS, 2023 added later on], the FIR No.68 dated 22.09.2024, has been lodged in Police Station Cheema, District Sangrur. With regard to commission of above mentioned offence, the petitioner has been arrested. He is in custody, and therefore, craving for the concession of bail. This is first petition for bail, filed by the petitioner, under Section 483 of BNSS.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being on the statement of Raveena Rani @ Paramjit Kaur wife of Gopal Singh. It was stated by the above-named complainant that her marriage with Gopal Singh was solemnized about 27 years ago and that her husband Gopal Singh, who retired from Indian Army was working as a



Security Guard in Udham Singh Academy. According to complainant Gopal Singh had illicit relations with a woman and that she (complainant) alongwith her son namely Amandeep Singh and daughter Neha Rani used to resist the above-mentioned illicit relationship of Gopal Singh.

3. It was further stated by the complainant that on 21.09.2024 at about 11 P.M. Gopal Singh had taken his meal at his parental home and came to home of complainant under the influence of liquor. As per complainant Gopal Singh picked up quarrel with the complainant and when her son Amandeep and daughter Neha Rani tried to reason out with the complainant he got enraged picked up a 12 bore gun and fired a gun shot, hitting Amandeep Singh and ultimately causing his death.

4. It is the case of the prosecution that on the basis of above-mentioned statement formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

5. Heard.

6. It has been contended on behalf of petitioner that the petitioner is innocent having no nexus whatsoever with the commission of crime and that she has been simply implicated in the present case, by alleging that she was having illicit relations with the main accused Gopal Singh and therefore, she entered into conspiracy to kill Amandeep Singh. According to learned counsel for the petitioner the only evidence which has been collected against the petitioner, is the confessional statement of co-accused, which is not admissible in evidence. It has also been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that otherwise also the contents of FIR itself shows that at the time of incident neither petitioner was present on the spot nor she was in any way instrumental



in the commission of crime.

7. Per contra, the learned State counsel has argued that a very specific and categorical role has been attributed to the petitioner being a co-conspirator in the commission of crime. As per learned State counsel the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and therefore the gravity of offence for which the conspiracy was hatched by the petitioner does not warrant the concession of bail for her.

8. Heard.

9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration, before arriving at any decision with regard to present petition for bail: -

- i) that the petitioner is already in custody for a period of more than 10 ½ months;
- ii) that as per contents of FIR she was not present at the spot at the time of commission of crime;
- iii) that there is nothing on record to show that anything is yet to be recovered from the possession of the petitioner. Thus, her detention in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any useful purpose;
- iv) that the trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- v) that the allegations contained in the FIR itself shows that the incident had taken place at the spur of moment and any act, overt or covert, in the commission of crime has not been attributed to the petitioner;
- vi) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner may tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses;



vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner will not co-operate/participate in the trial.

11. With regard to the legal aspect involved in the instant case, the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***"Dataram versus State of Uttar Pradesh and another"***, 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131, are relevant, wherein it has been observed that *"a fundamental postulate of criminal jurisprudence is the presumption of innocence, meaning thereby that a person is believed to be innocent until found guilty. However, there are instances in our criminal law where a reverse onus has been placed on an accused with regard to some specific offences but that is another matter and does not detract from the fundamental postulate in respect of other offences. Yet another important facet of our criminal jurisprudence is that the grant of bail is the general rule and putting a person in jail or in a prison or in a correction home (whichever expression one may wish to use) is an exception. Unfortunately, some of these basic principles appear to have been lost sight of with the result that more and more persons are being incarcerated and for longer periods. This does not do any good to our criminal jurisprudence or to our society. There is no doubt that the grant or denial of bail is entirely the discretion of the judge considering a case but even so, the exercise of judicial discretion has been circumscribed by a large number of decisions rendered by this Court and by every High Court in the country. Yet, occasionally there is a necessity to introspect whether denying bail to an accused person is the right thing to do on the facts and in the circumstances of a case"*.

12. The principles laid down by the Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India in the case of ***'Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another'***, 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 577, are also relevant in this



case. In the abovementioned case, it has been observed that “*the rate of conviction in criminal cases in India is abysmally low. It appears to us that this factor weighs on the mind of the Court while deciding the bail applications in a negative sense. Courts tend to think that the possibility of a conviction being nearer to rarity, bail applications will have to be decided strictly, contrary to legal principles. We cannot mix up consideration of a bail application, which is not punitive in nature with that of a possible adjudication by way of trial. On the contrary, an ultimate acquittal with continued custody would be a case of grave injustice*”.

13. Recently, in the case of ‘**Tapas Kumar Palit Vs. State of Chhattisgarh**’, 2022 INSC 222, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India has observed that “*if an accused is to get a final verdict after incarceration of six to seven years in jail as an undertrial prisoner, then, definitely, it could be said that his right to have a speedy trial under Article 21 of the Constitution has been infringed*”. It has also been observed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the abovementioned case that “*delays are bad for the accused and extremely bad for the victims, for Indian society and for the credibility of our justice system, which is valued. Judges are the masters of their Courtrooms and the Criminal Procedure Code provides many tools for the Judges to use in order to ensure that cases proceed efficiently*”.

14. Therefore, to elucidate further, this Court is conscious of the basic and fundamental principle of law that right to speedy trial is a part of reasonable, fair and just procedure enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This constitutional right cannot be denied to the accused as mandated by Hon’ble Apex court in “**Balwinder Singh versus State of**

***Punjab and Another”, SLP (Crl.) No.8523/2024.***

15. If the cumulative effect of all the abovementioned factors, involved in the instant case, is taken into consideration, it leads to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled for the benefit of bail, and that the present petition deserves to be allowed.

16. Accordingly, without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is hereby allowed. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing personal bond and surety bond(s) to the satisfaction of learned trial Court, subject to the following conditions:-

- (i) that the petitioner 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) that the petitioner shall at the time of execution of bond, furnish the address to the Court concerned and shall notify the change in address to the trial Court, till the final decision of the trial; and
- (iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the trial Court.

17. In case, the petitioner violates any of the conditions mentioned above, it shall be viewed seriously and the concession of bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled and the prosecution shall be at liberty to move an application in this regard.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

17.11.2025

vipin

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