

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-64793-2024
Date of decision: 22.04.2025

RAMANDEEP KAUR ALIAS RAMAN GILL ...PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB ...RESPONDENT

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present:- Mr. Manu Loona, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

 Mr. Rajinder Singh Bhatta, DAG, Punjab.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, petitioner seeks anticipatory bail in case FIR (Annexure P-1) as under:

FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
150	27.11.2024	108 of BNS	Arniwala, District Fazilka.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the order dated 24.03.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has already joined the investigation and as such prayed for confirming the interim bail granted vide order dated 24.03.2025.
3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Buta Singh, intimates the Court that the petitioner has joined investigation and is neither required for further investigation nor for any custodial interrogation.
4. During the course of hearing on 24.03.2025, following order was passed:

“ *Heard.*

It is inter alia contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely



CRM-M-64793-2024

2

implicated in this case. She submits that the petitioner has no concern whatsoever with the allegations levelled by the deceased nor is she instrumental in his committing the alleged suicide. She submits that in fact the deceased was suffering from depression and consumed celphos to end his life without there being any role on the part of the petitioner. She further submits that even the complainant has given an affidavit (Annexure P-3) giving clean chit to the petitioner having no role in the demise of his son. She further argued that the police has referred to the video clip of the deceased wherein he has named the petitioner, but he has nowhere uttered anything against the petitioner of having been instrumental in his committing the suicide. She further contends that the petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents and is ready to join investigation.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has assailed these arguments by submitting that the deceased had alleged in the video clip that the petitioner had harassed him, as such, the petitioner is not entitled to the concession of bail. He has however not disputed the fact that the complainant has given an affidavit (Annexure P-3) stating that the petitioner has no role in the demise of his son.

After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it is observed that admittedly, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and the base of the case against her is the video clip, wherein no specific overt act is attributed to her. Moreover, the complainant has given a specific affidavit (Annexure P-3) alleging no role qua the petitioner in the demise of his son.

Be it the case, without commenting on the merits of the case, it is deemed appropriate that the petitioner should join the investigation first, before deciding the petition on merits. Accordingly, the petitioner is hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and co-operate in the same. In the



CRM-M-64793-2024

3

event of the arrest of the petitioner, she shall be released on interim bail on her furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. She shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.

List on 22.04.2025.”

5. Keeping in view the above submissions made by learned State counsel and the fact that the petitioner had joined the investigation consequent to the order dated 24.03.2025 passed by this Court, interim bail granted vide order dated 24.03.2025 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482 (2) of BNSS, 2023. Further the petitioner is directed to join investigation as and when required in future by way of written notice for such purpose to be served by Investigating Officer of this case upon the petitioner; she will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.

6. The petition stands allowed.

7. It is made clear that anything contained hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(SANJIV BERRY)
JUDGE

22.04.2025
kanika

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |