



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

214 & 216

Date of decision: 11.12.2025

CRM-M-62092-2025

AJAYPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

CRM-M-67751-2025

HARPREET KAURPetitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRespondent

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

Present: - Ms. Amandeep Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-62092-2025.

Mr. Yashpal Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-67751-2025

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Mr. J.K. Singla, Advocate for the complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)
CRM-48464-2025 in CRM-M-67751-2025

Application is allowed as prayed for.

MAIN CASES

are being decided by a common order since they arise out of the same FIR.

2. The instant petition have been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for the grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 174 dated 19.10.2023, registered under Section(s) 302, 34, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Civil Lines Patiala, District Patiala.

3. As per the prosecution version, the present FIR was registered on the basis of the statement of Harpreet Kaur, wife of deceased Balbir Singh. She stated that she was married to Balbir Singh in 2005, this being his second marriage. From his first marriage with Jagdeep Kaur of District Faridkot, Balbir Singh had two daughters who presently reside with their mother in Canada. Balbir Singh retired as Senior Manager from Bank of Baroda, Nabha Branch, in August 2015. From the second marriage, the couple has two children, daughter Harbir Kaur (aged 13 years) and son Harbal Singh (aged 10 years). Harpreet Kaur stated that as per his daily routine on 19.10.2023, Balbir Singh went for a morning walk at around 5:15 a.m. to Environment Park, however, at around 6:00 a.m., former MC Parminder Shouri informed her that Balbir Singh had suffered injuries and was lying on the road near House No. 7D, Passi Road, Patiala and had been shifted to Manipal Hospital, Patiala. Upon reaching the hospital, she found that Balbir Singh had sustained a sharp-edged injury under the right jaw, had lost substantial blood and was declared dead. On this statement, FIR under Sections 302/34 IPC was registered against unknown persons. During investigation, the police recovered blood-stained earth, the weapon of offence (a knife) and a gents' purse containing the Aadhaar card of one Gurtej Singh of village Shadipur.

Post-mortem of Balbir Singh was thereafter conducted. On 21.10.2023, Kamalpreet Singh of Zirakpur approached the police and disclosed that accused Gurtej Singh, Arshpreet Singh and Ajay had confessed before him that Gurtej Singh was in a relationship with Harpreet Kaur and both intended to marry. Since Balbir Singh was objecting to their relationship, Harpreet Kaur and Gurtej Singh allegedly conspired to eliminate him. Harpreet Kaur informed Gurtej Singh of Balbir Singh's morning routine. Acting on this plan, on 19.10.2023, Gurtej Singh, along with Arshpreet and Ajay, armed with weapons, intercepted Balbir Singh near the Environment Park and caused fatal injuries to him. During the assault, Gurtej Singh dropped the knife at the spot. Kamalpreet Singh further stated that the accused sought his help in evading arrest. On the basis of his statement, the three accused, along with Harpreet Kaur, were were arrested and motorcycle No. PB-11CV-4039 used in the offence was seized.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner in CRM-M-62092-2025 submits that the only allegation against the petitioner is that he inflicted a datar blow and that a similarly placed co-accused, Gurtej Singh @ Gora, who was also attributed a datar blow, has already been granted the concession of regular bail by this Court vide order dated 04.11.2025, upon due consideration of the stage of trial and the period of custody undergone by him. Counsel further submits that the cause of death, as per the medical opinion, is attributable to a stab wound, which could not have been inflicted with a datar.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner in CRM-M-67751-2025, however, submits that the petitioner has been

nominated as an accused solely on the allegation of conspiracy, without any specific overt act being attributed to her. It is contended that no recovery of any nature whatsoever has been effected from the petitioner and she is not involved in any other criminal case. Counsel further submits that only 3 prosecution witnesses have been examined so far and the examination of the 4th witness is currently underway, out of a total of 27 witnesses cited by the prosecution. In these circumstances, the conclusion of the trial is likely to take considerable time.

6. Learned State Counsel does not dispute that the case of the petitioner in CRM-M-62092-2025 would be at par with that of Gurtej Singh @ Gora.

7. Counsel for the respondent-complainant Avtar Singh, brother-in-law of the deceased, however, contends that there are datar injuries on the neck of the deceased. On a query posed, he is, however, not in a position to clarify whether those injuries were simple or grievous in nature. He, however, does not dispute that the cause of death, as per the post-mortem report, stands opined to be stab injuries.

8. Counsel for the complainant, however, contends that petitioner-Harpreet Kaur acted as a conspirator at the instance of her paramour and that the remaining accused executed the offence pursuant to such conspiracy. He, however, does not dispute that no recovery whatsoever has been effected at the instance of petitioner-Harpreet Kaur at any stage of the proceedings.

9. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and upon considering the period of custody already undergone by the petitioner(s), the nature of injuries attributed to them, the

stage of the trial, as well as the fact that co-accused Gurtej Singh @ Gora has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 04.11.2025 passed in CRM-M-60457-2025, I deem it appropriate to enlarge both the petitioners on regular bail to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court.

10. The instant petitions are allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail on furnishing requisite bail bond/surety bond to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate, concerned.

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

12. 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.

DECEMBER 11, 2025

Vishal Sharma

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

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