



241

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

CRM-M-46954-2025

Date of decision : 10.12.2025

Jasvir Kaur

....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Ms. Pooja Dhingra, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Kanwaljeet Singh Brar, Advocate  
for the complainant.

**RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)**

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.113 dated 17.09.2024, under Sections 103(1)/61(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Nathana, Bathinda.

2. As per the facts of the case, the FIR was lodged on the statement of complainant, namely, Sukhmander Singh. It was alleged that they were 03 brothers and Parminder Singh @ Pindi (deceased) was younger to the complainant. It was alleged that Parminder Singh used to live in the adjacent house with his wife Jasvir Kaur (petitioner) and their son Sukhdeep Singh @ Sukhi. It was further alleged that his brother Parminder Singh was an active member of Bharti Kisan Union Dakauda and used to visit the Union oftenly and on account of this, there used to be dispute between him and his wife. On 17.09.2024 at about 7:30 pm, he went to the house of his brother Parminder Singh and he saw that his sister-in-law (bhabhi), Jasvir Kaur, was talking to her son Sukhdeep Singh that he should run away from there as whatever was to happen has already



happened. The complainant rushed inside the house and saw his brother Parminder Singh lying on the bed and was bleeding from the head and throat. It was alleged that the wife of his brother and the son, both in conspiracy with each other, have killed his brother. Thus, the request was made to take the legal action against the culprits. On registration of FIR, investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 17.09.2024. On completion of investigation, challan was presented. On framing of charges, the trial commenced. The petitioner approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Bathinda, praying for grant of bail, however, finding no merit, the same was declined after hearing both the sides by Learned trial Court vide order dated 12.08.2025. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner is before this Court praying for grant of bail by way of filing of present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is the wife of the deceased and it is because of the same, she has been implicated in the present case. She submits that the dispute between the husband and wife was not serious, however, the same has been manipulated by the prosecution in order to rope the petitioner in the present case. She submits that the petitioner is a lady, who has no criminal antecedents and she is behind bars since the date of her arrest. She submits that as per the prosecution the death has taken place on account of the blow of *kahi* and the petitioner cannot be alleged to have given the same. She submits that in the overall facts and circumstances, it is apparent that the place of occurrence was the *Dhani* of the petitioner and there was no one to witness the same. It is submitted that the implication of the petitioner is purely on the basis of presumptions and assumptions. She, thus, submits that the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.




4. Learned counsel for the complainant, however, has opposed the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is none other than the wife of the deceased. He submits that there was already a family dispute between the husband and wife and number of times she used to leave the house and go to her parental home. He submits that both the petitioner and her son, in connivance with each other has committed the offence of murdering the brother of the complainant. He, thus, prays for rejection of bail of the present petition.

5. Per contra, learned State counsel has also opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and submits that the place of occurrence is the house of the petitioner and he was found murdered there. He submits that the complainant is the last seen witness. It is submitted that out of total 19 prosecution witnesses, only 02 witnesses have been partly examined. He has produced on record the custody certificate of the petitioner.

6. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the deceased was the husband of the petitioner. As per the postmortem report, the injury had been found to have been given by a *Kahi* on the neck and head of the deceased. The petitioner and her son, both are behind bars. The custody certificate produced would show that the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 01 year, 02 months and 19 days as on 09.12.2025. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.



8. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, the Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for the grant of bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, present petition is allowed and petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.12.2025  
*ps-I*

( RAJESH BHARDWAJ )  
JUDGE

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