



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

210-2

CRM-M-64517-2024 (O&amp;M)

Date of Decision: 24.02.2025

RAVNEET KAUR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present:- Mr. Kulbhushan Raheja, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. R.S.Thind, DAG Punjab.

\*\*\*\*\*

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. Apprehending arrest the petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 of BNSS for grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.149 dated 09.11.2024, under Sections 108 and 3(5) of BNS, registered at Police Station Urban Estate, District Patiala.

2. The following order was passed on 26.12.2024:-

*"1. Pursuant to the order dated 20.12.2024, passed by this Bench, separate replies by way of affidavits of Sh. Manoj Gors, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, City-II, District Patiala, along with Annexures R-1/T and R-2 have been filed in Court today by learned State counsel. The same are taken on record.*

*2. As per the version of the prosecutrix-Harpreet Kaur (since deceased) was married to Jaspreet Singh on 24.09.2018. The petitioner- Ravneet Kaur is sister of Jaspreet Singh and petitioner-Balkar Singh is the brother-in-law of Jaspreet Singh. It is the case of the prosecution that petitioner-Ravneet Kaur, who is married sister of Jaspreet Singh came to her matrimonial home along with her husband Balkar Singh-petitioner about 2½ years ago and she along with her husband started living in her parental home.*

*2.1 It is alleged that the petitioners used to harass Harpreet Kaur and they used to comment upon her character. Ultimately, she was shunted out of her matrimonial house along with her husband and they started residing in a rented accommodation in Tripuri Town Patiala. It is in allegation that the petitioner-Ravneet Kaur, as well as her mother Kulwant Kaur even used to go to the rented accommodation and they used to harass the deceased. Ultimately, they shifted their residence to Village Chaura.*

*2.2 On 09.11.2024, at about 02:00 p.m., Kulwant Kaur-mother of the petitioner-Ravneet Kaur is alleged to have visited the parental house of*



*the deceased in Village Puniajattan. She had a fight with the deceased's mother and also levelled false allegations against her daughter's character. While going back, she also took along with her Sehajpreet Singh (son of the deceased). Thereafter, at about 03:00 p.m., the deceased committed suicide by hanging herself with the ceiling fan of the room. The complainant, who is the brother of the deceased reached the spot upon receiving the information. The other relatives of the deceased also reached at the spot. The noose was cut and body of the victim was taken down and was taken to the hospital where she was declared dead.*

*2.3 A suicide note written in a note-book was also recovered which was lying beneath the pillow in the bed room of the deceased. The suicide note reads as under:-*

*"I Harpreet Kaur have been harassed by my mother-in-law a lot, my mother-in-law neither allows me to stay at my matrimonial house and nor outside on rent. She ruined my life. She has kept her daughter Reetu and son-in-law Balkar Singh in her house and has turned us out from the house. For my death, Kulwant kaur, her daughter Reetu and son-in-law Balkar Singh are responsible."*

*3. Both learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the deceased was living in a separate house at the time of alleged occurrence. The petitioners have no connection with the cause of commission of suicide by the victim. The petitioners are being falsely implicated. They are ready to join the investigation.*

*4. Learned counsel appearing for petitioner-Balkar Singh has placed reliance upon the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Vikas Chandra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and another 2024 (4) RCR (Criminal) 232 and S.S.Chheena Vs. Vijay Kumar Mahajan and another 2010(4) RCR (Criminal) 66.*

*5. Learned counsel for the petitioner-Ravneet Kaur has placed reliance upon the decision of this Court in Sunil Chauhan Vs. State of Haryana and another 2024 (4) RCR (Criminal) 688.*

*6. I have considered the arguments raised by learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the paper-book, as well as replies filed by learned State counsel in Court today.*

*7. It is not disputed that both the petitioners were residing in a separate house whereas victim was residing in a rented accommodation at the time of alleged occurrence. There are no specific attribution to the petitioner by way of a specific act instigating the victim for commission of suicide in the suicide note left by the deceased victim. In the suicide note, the primary allegations are against the mother-in-law. The petitioners are ready to join the investigation. The petitioner-Ravneet Kaur is married sister-in-law of the victim where Balkar Singh is the brother-in-law of the victim. Admittedly, they were not present at the time of occurrence. The mother-in-law of the victim is alleged to have visited the house of the victim immediately prior to the occurrence and the allegations for taking away the son of the victim are also lie. In such circumstances, it is debateable as to whether the petitioners have abetted the commission of suicide by the victim?*

*8. Adjourned to 24.02.2025.*

*9. In the meanwhile, in the event of the arrest of the petitioners, they shall be released on interim bail, on their furnishing bail bonds and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the arresting officer/Area Magistrate and also subject to the following conditions:-*

*(i) That the petitioners shall further make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.*

*(ii) That the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.*

*(iii) That the petitioners shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Trial Court/CJM concerned.*



*A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of the other connected case.”*

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, from Inspector Amandeep Singh submits that in compliance of order dated 26.12.2024, the petitioner has joined the investigation and is not required for any further investigation.

4. Having considered the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the petition is allowed. Order dated 26.12.2024 passed by this Court, is hereby made absolute.

5. This order should not be treated as "blanket" order. It will not be read granting the petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned ibid and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. This order does not in any manner limit or restrict the rights or duties of the police or investigating agency to investigate into the charges against the petitioner.

7. The accused/petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him or her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

8. The accused/petitioner shall not leave India without prior permission of the Court.

9. The accused/petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the police.

10. It will be open to the police or the investigating agency to move to this Court for a direction under Section 483(3) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 439(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) to arrest the



accused, in the event of violation of any term, such as absconding, non-cooperating during investigation, evasion, intimidation or inducement to witnesses with a view to influence outcome of the investigation or trial.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of accordingly.

24.02.2025  
*Kavita*

(KIRTI SINGH)  
JUDGE

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