



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

237

CRM-M-36447 of 2025
Date of decision: 17.07.2025

Dolly Mishra

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. GREWAL

Present: Ms. Monika Goyal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner is seeking regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS of 2023 in case FIR No.241 dated 07.11.2024, under Sections 103(1) and 3(5) of BNS of 2023, registered at Police Station Ludhiana, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. Case of the prosecution is that Punita Mishra wife of Pawan Kumar had an illicit relation with Rajan Shukla and few days before the death of deceased-Pawan Kumar, Rajan Shukla grabbed the neck of deceased and had issued death threats. Thereafter, on 07.11.2024, at about 6:00 am, the body of the deceased was found in his land. The role of the petitioner is that she being sister-in-law of the deceased had conspired with the main accused Rajan Shukla and Punita Mishra to kill the deceased. However, there is no evidence on record to prove any such conspiracy.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and there is no evidence on record to prove the conspiracy. As per custody certificate, petitioner is in custody for the last 8 months and 6 days and trial is yet to commence. Trial is likely to



take time for its conclusion and continuous detention of the petitioner would not serve the ends of justice, therefore, petitioner be released on regular bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. He vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Learned State counsel has filed the custody certificate in the Court today, which is taken on record. As per custody certificate dated 16.07.2025, the petitioners are in custody for 8 months and 6 days.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. In view of the above submission of learned counsel for the parties and considering the custody period undergone by the petitioner and the fact that trial is yet to commence and the same is likely to take a long time, the continuous detention of the petitioners would not serve the ends of justice. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court deems it a fit case to grant the concession of regular bail to the petitioners during the pendency of the trial.

8. Therefore, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the instant petition is allowed. The petitioner is hereby ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing requisite bail bonds, surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate concerned.



9. However, it is made clear that in case the petitioners misuse the concession of bail, the State would be at liberty to seek cancellation of their bail.

(H.S. GREWAL)
JUDGE

17.07.2025
anil

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