



CRM-M-34669-2024

-1-

107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34669-2024

Date of Decision:- 18.11.2025

Piari @ Piarai

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Parvesh, Advocate for
Mr. A.P.S. Rehan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.(Oral)

1. Petitioner – Piari @ Piarai has filed petition under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of regular bail in FIR No. 157 dated 08.11.2022 under Section 306 IPC (Section 302 and 304-B IPC added subsequently) registered at Police Station Ghuman, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. As per the facts of case, complainant Tarsem Masih gave his statement that his daughter Reena aged about 29 years was married to Rashpal Masih about four years ago. Out of this wedlock, she was having two sons. Husband Rashpal Masih and his parents i.e. Karma Masih-father-in-law, Piari-mother-in-law used to harass his daughter on account of demand for dowry. A complaint was filed to police about one year ago but compromise was effected with in-laws family. Despite said compromise, accused persons did not mend their ways and continued to harass his daughter. On 07.11.2022, he received a call from his daughter that she was



CRM-M-34669-2024

-2-

being harassed by her husband and both in-laws on account of their demand for dowry. He told his daughter that he would visit her in-laws on the next day. On 08.11.2022 at about 05:00 am, he received call from his son-in-law Rashpal Masih informing that his daughter has ended her life by hanging. He alongwith his relatives reached village Kohali and saw dead body of his daughter lying on a cot in verandah of house. There were marks of dupatta around her neck. He had firm belief that his daughter ended her life on account of maltreatment on account of demand for dowry raised by her husband and both in-laws.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that allegations levelled against petitioner are without any basis. Complainant gave improved version by supplementary statement recorded on 09.11.2022. On that supplementary statement, offence under Section 302 IPC was added. Petitioner is an old lady. After completion of investigation, challan is already presented. She was arrested on 30.12.2022 and since then she is facing trial. Statements of witnesses are being recorded. She cannot be kept behind the bars for indefinite time period. Therefore, her regular bail petition may be allowed.

4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State of Punjab. Status report has been filed confirming the aforesaid factual position regarding the allegations detailed in FIR and presentation of challan. It is pointed out that initially FIR was registered under Section 306 IPC. Later on vide GD No. 28 dated 09.11.2022, offence under Section 302 IPC was added. At the time of presentation of challan, offence under Section 304-B IPC was enhanced vide DDR No. 17 dated 02.02.2023.



CRM-M-34669-2024

-3-

Challan was presented on 03.02.2023. At present 10 prosecution witnesses have been examined out of 21 witnesses. Allegations are serious. Victim died unnatural death. Copy of Postmortem report is already annexed as Annexure P/5. Therefore, considering the gravity of offence, petitioner is not entitled to be released on regular bail.

5. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. It is a case of unnatural death of victim Reena in matrimonial home. At the time of death, she was 29 years old and mother of two sons. As per facts narrated in FIR, occurrence took place within four years of marriage. On the presentation of challan, charges were framed and trial is going on. At present statement of complainant Tarsem Masih has been recorded as PW-1 (Annexure P-3) and statement of Meeta Masih has been recorded as PW-2 (Annexure P-4). Prosecution witnesses have supported the allegations against petitioner. It is a case of loss of life of a young bride in matrimonial home. Considering the gravity of offence, I do not find a fit case for grant of regular bail to petitioner Piari @ Piarai and present petition filed by her is accordingly, dismissed.

6. Considering the long custody of petitioner of more than 02 years and 10 months, trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

18.11.2025

lalit

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No