

2025:PHHC:076366



107

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32785-2025
DECIDED ON: 19.06.2025

SIYA RAM ALIAS JASVIR SINGH

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 (438 of Cr.P.C.) for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.31, dated 30.04.2025, under Sections 80, 3(5) of BNS registered at Police Station Sadar Rampura, District Bathinda (Annexure P-1).

2. Prosecution story setup in the present case as per the version in the FIR as under:-

“Statement of Ramu Ram son of Dara Ram son of Lalu Ram, resident of Village Harnam Singh Wala, Police Station Phul, District Bathinda, aged approximately 45 years, Mobile Number 82830-87706, stated that he is a resident of the aforementioned address. He is illiterate and works as a laborer. He has two daughters and one son, among whom the eldest daughter is Maya Kaur, aged approximately 20 years, followed by his younger daughter Kirna Kaur, and the youngest son is Ajay Ram. My daughter, Maya Kaur's wedding took place on April 11, 2024, with Happy Ram son of Gurtej

Ram, resident of Jethuke. The ceremony was conducted according to customs at Heritage Palace, Burj Gill. At the time of the wedding, we gave our daughter dowry according to our financial capacity. Approximately 7 lakh rupees were spent on the wedding. However, just about month after the wedding, my daughter Maya Kaur's in-laws started harassing her for more a dowry. I had given dowry, a Bullet motorcycle as but when we found out that the groom, Happy Ram, was involved in drug use, we took the motorcycle back to our village, fearing he might sell it. Because of this, my daughter's in-laws continuously harassed her. We even took her back to her in-laws' house twice through community mediation. Approximately 20 days ago, we left our daughter at her in-laws' house through community mediation, and we also left the Bullet motorcycle at their home. Just about five days ago, we visited our daughter's in-laws' home in village Jethuke. There, we told my daughter's in-laws not to harass her without reason, but they remained adamant about their demand for a car as dowry and threatened that if their demand for a car wasn't met, they wouldn't let our daughter live there. Today, around 4 PM, we received news that my daughter, Maya Kaur, had died at her in-laws' house. When I arrived at her in-laws' home in village Jethuke with my family members and relatives, my daughter's body was lying on a cot in the veranda, and no family members were present in the house. When we checked my daughter Maya Kaur's body, there were marks on her neck. My daughter, Maya Kaur, was strangled or hanged to death by her husband, Happy Ram son of Gurtej Ram; her brother-in-law, Sia Ram son of Gurtej Ram; her mother-in-law, Rani Kaur, wife of Gurtej Ram; and her sister-in-law, Anju Kaur, daughter of Gurtej Ram, all residents of Jethuke. They colluded and committed this murder over demands for more dowry. Therefore, legal action should be taken against them. You have written, read, and heard my statement, and it is correct. Ram Ram, as stated above, attested by Vicky Ram son of Charna Ram, resident of Harnam Singh Wala, and Joginder Singh S1, Station House Officer, Sadar Rampura Police Station, dated: 30-04-2025."

3. **Contention**

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and was not present at the place of occurrence at the relevant time, as he was at his own residence. In support of this contention, CCTV footage has been placed on record by way of a pen drive.

Counsel further undertakes, on behalf of the petitioner, that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with and join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Sandeep Singh, AAG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He prays for dismissal of the present petition stating that the petitioner has been specifically named in the FIR.

4. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given thoughtful consideration to the submissions advanced above particularly the fact that the presence of the petitioner at the place of occurrence is disputed, and the State has failed to produce any incriminating material directly linking the petitioner to the alleged offence, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent ground to deny bail to the petitioner. It is also pertinent to note that the petitioner has demonstrated bona fide intentions and has undertaken, as stated in paragraph 11 of the petition, to join the investigation and cooperate with the Investigating Agency to ensure timely submission of the final report.

5. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

- (i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- (ii) a condition that the person 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 from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- (iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*
- (iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'*

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

19.06.2025

Meenu

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