



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

233

CRM-M-23262-2025
Decided on : 07.08.2025

Pinky Rani . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. C.S. Jattana, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manjinder S. Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Pinky Rani	210	09.11.2023	302, 201 of IPC	Boha	Mansa

2. FIR has been got lodged at the instance of the complainant – Omparkash (father of the deceased Rinku). The incident took place on 15.12.2022, when allegedly the petitioner and the deceased were alone at home, while the other family members had gone to Rajasthan to attend a marriage function of some relatives. As per the FIR, Rinku (deceased) was taken to the hospital by the petitioner along with some other persons, and was thereafter admitted to the Civil Hospital, Budladha, where his postmortem was conducted.

3. The complainant has alleged in the FIR, which was got registered



after a long delay of 11 months and 5 days, that his son died due to a heart attack, whereas, as per the postmortem report, it was revealed that he died due to poisoning. Raising suspicion against the petitioner, the FIR was registered on 19.11.2023.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that the huge delay itself is enough to assume that a false version has been introduced by the complainant (father of the deceased) with the motive to deprive the petitioner of her right of succession to the estate belonging to the deceased, including other ancestral properties. Without there being any supportive or substantial evidence, and also considering the fact that it is admittedly the petitioner who accompanied the deceased to the hospital, no definite view or assumption can be drawn at this stage to allege that the petitioner is the murderer of her own husband.

5. The aspect of detection of poison is yet to be determined by the trial Court after considering all the facts and circumstances and after evaluating the evidence from both sides. Counsel also argues that the possibility of declaring the present case as one of suicide case, cannot be ruled out, especially in view of the fact that no injury was noticed by the doctor on the dead body at the time of conducting the postmortem examination.

The petitioner is stated to be in custody since 10th November, 2023, and out of total of 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. There is no other criminal case registered against the petitioner. Thus, learned counsel prays for grant of concession of regular bail to the petitioner.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made in the petition, however, he does not dispute the factual position as narrated by the petitioner's counsel. Besides, petitioner is



stated to be inside jail for a period of more than 18 months and out of total of 16 prosecution witnesses, none has been examined so far. Thus, culmination of trial shall take considerable time. It is also noticeable that petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, and after hearing the rival submissions of both sides, this Court is of the considered view that the liberty of the petitioner cannot be curtailed for an indefinite period, in the absence of any incriminating circumstances.

8. Accordingly, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

9. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

10. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

11. Petition stands **disposed of**.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 07, 2025

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/~~No~~

Whether Reportable: Yes/~~No~~