



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

216

CRM-M No.53765 of 2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision:26.09.2025

Sandeep Kaur**.....Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab****..... Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH****Present:** Mr.Swarn Tiwana, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG Punjab.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J. (Oral):

For the commission of offence punishable under Section 108 of BNS, FIR No.174 dated 13.07.2025, has been lodged in Police Station Samrala, District Khanna/Ludhiana. The petitioner has been arrested in the above mentioned case as an accused. Since the petitioner is in custody, he has filed the present petition for the benefit of bail. This is first petition under Section 483 of BNSS for grant of bail.

2. In nut-shell, the facts emerging from the record are that the FIR of this case came into being in response to a statement of Navneet Kaur who has stated that her brother has committed suicide, and that the petitioner was having a marital discord with her husband, was involved in litigation with her husband and a petition for divorce was under consideration. As per complainant, the petitioner used to pressurise complainant's brother namely Davinder Singh to perform marriage and that due to the pressure applied by the



petitioner, Davinder Singh has committed suicide by consuming a poisonous substance.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Since advance notice has already been served, Mr. K.D. Sachdeva, DAG Punjab, appears on behalf of respondent-State, and waives service.

5. Learned State Counsel has filed custody certificate of the petitioner. The same be taken on record. However, no formal reply has been filed by the State and the learned State counsel has opted to oppose the present petition orally.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is a married lady and has a matrimonial dispute with her husband. As per learned counsel for the petitioner any specific allegation as to how the petitioner was pressurizing the deceased, or how she had abetted the commission of suicide, does not find mentioned in the FIR lodged against the petitioner. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, without any fault she is facing incarceration for a period of almost two months and therefore, she is entitled to bail.

8. Per contra, the learned State counsel has argued that name of the petitioner figures in the FIR, and that there are very specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner. According to learned State counsel, the petitioner, who is responsible for the death of a young person, is not entitled for the benefit of bail.



9. The record has been perused carefully.

10. A careful perusal of record shows that in the present case there are several factors which are required to be taken into consideration for the decision of instant bail petition. They are as under:-

- i) that as per record the allegations as contained in the FIR are very vague with regard to the details of the manner in which abetment was made by the petitioner;
- ii) that the petitioner being a lady requires concessional view;
- iii) that nothing is left to be recovered from the possession of the petitioner;
- iv) that the petitioner has already suffered incarceration for a period of 1 month and 24 days;
- v) that the investigation and trial is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that detention of the petitioner behind the bar is not likely to serve any purpose;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that if released on bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence with witnesses.

11. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the aforesaid factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for the concession of bail. Thus, present petition deserves to be allowed.

12. In view of above mentioned observations the present petition is



hereby allowed accordingly, and the petitioner is admitted to bail subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

13. It is, however, made clear that any observation made here-in-above is only for the purpose of deciding the present petition, and the same shall have no bearing on the merits of the case.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

26.09.2025
Manoj Bhutani

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