



CRM-M-45186-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

203-2

CRM-M-45186-2025
Decided on :17.10.2025

Manjinder Kaur

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the BNSS Act, seeking regular bail in case FIR No. 33 dated 07.05.2025, under Sections 103(1), 61(1) of BNS, 2023 (Sections 302 and 120-B IPC), registered at Police Station Dhilwan, District Kapurthala.

2. Deceased-Rajvir Kaur was the daughter-in-law of the petitioner. As per the allegations in FIR, Amritpal Singh (son of the petitioner) and deceased-Rajvir Kaur were married on 31.08.2014, and two children were born out of the said wedlock. Amritpal Singh used to reside in Italy, and it is alleged that petitioner used to harass and trouble deceased-Rajvir Kaur regarding her character. Amritpal Singh returned



CRM-M-45186-2025

2

from Italy to India on 01.05.2025 and subsequently took his wife (the deceased) to his house on 02.05.2025.

It is further alleged in the FIR that complainant was informed telephonically by her daughter Rajvir Kaur (deceased) that, at the instigation of her mother-in-law, her husband used to physically assault her and had even broken her phone. FIR also states that on the evening of 06.05.2025, as informed telephonically by the deceased, her husband Amritpal Singh was quarrelling with her and threatening to kill her, instructing her to leave the house. Subsequently, complainant received information regarding the death of her daughter. Upon reaching her in-laws' house, she found the deceased Rajvir Kaur was lying on a bed in a room situated on the upper floor of the house. She also noticed marks on the right side of the neck and under the chin on the left side of deceased-Rajvir Kaur.

Complainant expressed her suspicion in the FIR that her daughter did not commit suicide but was instead strangled to death during the night of 6/7.05.2025 by her husband, at the instigation and with the support of his mother, Manjinder Kaur (petitioner herein).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to the photographs (P-2) and submits that, in fact, the deceased was in a relationship with one Gurjeet Singh, who was held responsible for her death through a suicide note found near the deceased's body, which was handed over to the police at the initial stage of the investigation.



Counsel further contends that even if the allegations are taken at their face value, nothing substantial has been alleged against the petitioner except for harassment, taunting, or causing trouble on account of the deceased's character. Moreover, there is no evidence to specifically implicate the petitioner as the person, who created such a situation that would amount to abetment of suicide.

Counsel further submits that, according to the FIR, deceased informed her mother (the complainant) that her husband used to beat her, threatened to kill her, and told her to leave the house.

4. By relying on this part of the FIR, Mr. Vikas Bali, Advocate for the petitioner, argues that the prosecution's case primarily implicates the husband of the deceased as the prime accused, while the petitioner has been made a co-accused merely due she being mother of husband of the deceased and her residence in the same house. There is no substantial evidence collected against the petitioner even during the course of the investigation.

Counsel also argues that petitioner is not alleged to have caused any injury at any specific time during nearly eight to nine years of marriage, as no such incident is mentioned in the FIR. Petitioner is in custody since 07.05.2025, and after completion of the investigation, the final report under Section 193 BNSS has been submitted. Counsel therefore submits that the petitioner's incarceration—who is a 60-year-old senior citizen and a woman—serves no meaningful purpose for the prosecution and requests her release.



CRM-M-45186-2025

4

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the petitioner is one of the main accused as per the allegations in the FIR. It is contended that she has been taunting and troubling the deceased, and therefore, no leniency should be extended in granting bail as prayed for by the petitioner.

On asking of the Court, learned State counsel further submits that there are a total of 20 prosecution witnesses, all of whom must be examined after the framing of charges to establish the charges against the accused.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and examined the material available on record.

7. At this stage, no opinion or comment is required regarding the photographs of the suicide note or its veracity; these issues will, of course, be subject to trial if either party brings them on record. Even if the allegations are taken at face value, there is neither any allegation of harassment on account of dowry nor any demand against the petitioner. The complainant, who is not expected to reside with the deceased at her matrimonial house, has registered the FIR based on information received from her daughter (the deceased) that the petitioner used to harass, taunt, and cause trouble in the deceased's life. Such allegations are yet to be proved before the Court during the trial proceedings.

Even if these allegations are proved, it cannot presently be assumed that petitioner was a cause of the deceased-Rajvir Kaur's death.



CRM-M-45186-2025

5

Therefore, this Court is of the view that petitioner need not be kept in jail at this stage.

Consequently, prayer made in the instant petition is allowed.

Petitioner is ordered to released on bail, subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

8. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible in accordance with law.

10. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

17.10.2025

Rashmi

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