



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRA-D-892-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-16.7.2025

Amandeep Kaur ... Appellant

Versus

State of Punjab ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI**

Present:- Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Siddharth Attri, AAG, Punjab,
assisted by Sub Inspector Nishan Singh.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. Amandeep Kaur assails order dated 21.5.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur vide which the learned Court dismissed an application filed by the appellant seeking anticipatory bail in respect of a case registered vide FIR No.8, dated 17.2.2025 at Police Station Kotli Surat Mallian, Police District Batala, District Gurdspur, Punjab, under Sections 109, 324(4), 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (BNS), Sections 3, 4 and 5 of Explosive Act, 1908 & Sections 13, 16, 17, 18, 18(B) and 20 of Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act.
2. The translated gist of the FIR lodged on the statement of SI Jasjit Singh reads as under:



“Today, when I was present at Adda Shikar Machhiyan in search of anti-social persons, a secret informer informed me that today at around 08:10 PM, some unknown motorcyclists dropped some explosive substance at the house of Sukhdev Singh son of Puran Singh, resident of Raimal with an intention of kill him and thereby caused an explosion, which resulted in damage to his house. Since, by doing so these unknown persons have committed offence punishable u/ss 109, 324(4) BNS & Sections 3, 4, 5 of the EXPLOSIVE ACT 1908, intimation is being sent to the Police Station for registration of FIR. Sd/- Jasjit Singh, SI/SHO, P.S. Kotli Surat Malli.”

3. Short reply by way of affidavit of Shri Joga Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Dera Baba Nanak, Police District Batala has been filed by learned State counsel today in Court, which is taken on record.
4. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant is nowhere named in the FIR and is sought to be nominated on the basis of a string of disclosure statements. It has further been submitted that, in any case, the appellant cannot even be connected with any of the ‘call-detail record’ stated to have been collected by the police during the course of investigation.
5. On the other hand, learned State counsel submitted that during the course of investigation sufficient evidence has been collected to show the complicity of the appellant. Learned State counsel pointed out that co-accused Vishal Bhatti in his disclosure statement specifically disclosed that an amount of Rs.25,000/- was sent by Ranjodh Singh @ Jodha (son of applicant) to Mohit Dhiman in Himachal Pradesh and that said Mohit Dhiman further gave this amount to Vishal Bhatti and that Vishal Bhatti during his disclosure statement nominated the appellant. Said Vishal Bhatti in his disclosure statement stated



that Ranjodh Singh after talking to his father Pargat Singh gave an amount of Rs.5,000/- to him (Vishal Bhatti) and that the said fact was known to Ranjodh Singh' mother i.e. the applicant and also known to his wife Manpreet Kaur, who knew about the entire plan. Learned State counsel informed that the appellant – Amandeep Kaur is none else but mother of Ranjodh Singh and wife of Pargat Singh.

6. We have considered rival submissions addressed before this Court.
7. The entire case against the appellant is based on disclosure statement of Vishal Bhatti. In the said disclosure statement of Vishal Bhatti as has been referred to in paragraph No.4 of the reply, vague allegations have been levelled against all the members of the family of Ranjodh Singh to the effect that they knew about payment of amount to Vishal Bhatti and the “work” to be done by the accused. There is no evidence to show that the appellant was ever in touch with any of the co-accused. The appellant, who is a lady aged about 50 years and is a housewife, otherwise has a clean record and happens to be mother of Ranjodh Singh in whose account there is some monetary transaction. Apart from aforesaid disclosure statement, there is no other evidence to connect the applicant with the offence.
8. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we find that the evidence collected cannot be said to be sufficient to be *prima facie* hold that the appellant is involved in the alleged occurrence. The instant appeal, as such, is accepted and the appellant, in the event of her arrest, is ordered to be released on bail subject to her furnishing personal bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer. However, the appellant shall join the investigation as and when called upon to do so and cooperate



CRA-D-892-2025 (O&M) (4)

with the Investigating Officer and shall also abide by the conditions as provided under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

16.7.2025
Pankaj

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

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