

2025:PHHC:171945



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

104

**CRM-M-45625-2024
Date of decision: 10.12.2025**

SUMAN

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Brijesh Nandan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Addl. A.G. Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 105 dated 25.07.2018, registered under Section(s) 302, 460 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station B Division, District Amritsar.

2. The aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of Gulzar Singh, son of Kartar Singh, who made a statement to the effect that he and his siblings comprise six brothers and sisters. His eldest sister, Jagjit Kaur, had already passed away and his younger sister, Inderjit Kaur, who was visually impaired, used to reside alone in her house. His other siblings include Satnam

Kaur, residing in Amritsar; Satinder Kaur, residing in Batala and the youngest

brother, Kawaljit Singh, residing in Delhi. It was further stated that Inderjit Kaur had served as a music lecturer and had retired in the year 2012. He disclosed that Surjit Kaur @ Sukhi, wife of Dalbir Singh, regularly visited Inderjit Kaur's residence to assist with cooking and cleaning. Additionally, Davinder Singh, son of Surjan Singh, was also known to frequent her house and was entrusted with handling her financial transactions. Gulzar Singh further stated that on 25.07.2018, while he was at his own residence, he received information that his sister Inderjit Kaur had been murdered by some unknown persons in her bedroom. Upon reaching her house around noon, he saw her lying on the bed with her legs dangling and observed that she appeared to have been smothered with a pillow. Subsequently, during the course of investigation, the complainant recorded a supplementary statement alleging that the present petitioner, Ranjit Singh, along with his wife Suman, acting in conspiracy, had committed the murder of his sister, Inderjit Kaur.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the present matter pertains to a blind murder and no overt act has been attributed to the petitioner herself. It is pointed out that the prosecution case rests primarily on the testimony of a night watchman, who stated that he saw the petitioner's husband hurriedly exiting the residence of the deceased while carrying a polythene bag. It is submitted that the involvement of the petitioner, at best, is solely of a conspirator with her husband in the commission of the said offence. It is further contended that the petitioner has been in custody since 27.07.2018 and has undergone actual custody of more than seven years. The trial has yet to be concluded, as out of the 26 witnesses cited by the prosecution, 11 witnesses still remain to be examined.

4. Learned State Counsel, however, contends that the recovery of the identification documents of the deceased, Inderjit Kaur, from the petitioner's residence pursuant to her disclosure indicates her participation in the commission of the offence. He, however, does not dispute that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case and has already undergone actual custody of more than 7 years. He also does not dispute that 11 prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined.

5. Having heard learned Counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the prolonged period of actual custody and the stage of the trial, I deem it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail to the satisfaction of the trial Court.

6. The instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on his furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

7. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witnesses in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the Trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

DECEMBER 10, 2025
Vishal Sharma

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