



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

104**CRM-M-65498-2025****Date of decision: 20th November, 2025**

Jasbir Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Manbir Singh Basra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

MANISHA BATRA, J (ORAL):-

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No. 165 dated 09.09.2025 registered under Sections 103, 61(2), 3(5), 249, 253 and 111 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Shri Hargobindpur, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Nirmal Singh on 09.09.2025, alleging that on the same day at about 4:15 PM, he was present in the house of his brother Jugraj Singh and was sitting in the drawing room along with his sister-in-law Jaspreet Kaur and brother. His brother was running an office on the ground floor. Jagdeep Singh an Assistant of his brother called



Jugraj Singh down stairs by saying that someone had come to meet him, as soon as Jugraj Singh went down stairs, two youths who had come in a car and were standing there, fired shot with bullet thereby hitting Jugraj Singh and then they fled away. On hearing the noise, the complainant and his sister-in-law came in the balcony and saw those youths while fleeing away. The victim was rushed to the hospital but succumbed to the firearm injury. Suspecting that one Amarbir Singh and Ravinder Kaur had hand in the murder of the victim since they were holding grudges against him, he prayed for taking action. After registration of the FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. On 12.09.2025, the complainant recorded a supplementary statement to the effect that accused Harmanpreet Singh was driver of the car of the assailants. He was nominated as such and was arrested on 14.09.2025. On interrogation, he suffered disclosure statement to the effect that he along with the co-accused Varinder Singh had fired shots thereby committing murder of the victim on asking of Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi who was living abroad and also disclosed that prior to committing murder, the present petitioner who is mother of the accused Gurpreet Singh @ Gopi and father Jagdish Singh had done *reiki* to facilitate the murder. The petitioner, her husband and son were nominated as additional accused. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur, which was dismissed vide order dated 06.11.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. She was not named in the FIR. The disclosure statement of the co-accused cannot be considered to be admissible



in evidence. She had no connection with the occurrence. She was present at her house on the fateful day. Her implication is because of political rivalry. No recovery is to be effected from her. Her custodial interrogation is not required. She is ready to join the investigation. It is, therefore, urged that she deserves to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel has advance notice of the petition and is ready to argue the matter. It is submitted by her that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. No exceptional and extra ordinary circumstance has been made out for grant of bail of the petitioner. It is, therefore, urged that she does not deserve to be given benefit of anticipatory bail.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The petitioner is alleged to be a part of conspiracy hatched to eliminate the victim Jugraj Singh and as per the allegations, she and her husband had done *reiki* about the whereabouts of the victim Jugraj Singh and had given information about the same to the co-accused Harmanpreet Singh and Varinder Singh, who had fired shots upon the victim thereby causing his homicidal death on 09.09.2025. Allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. For the purpose of conducting deeper probe and thorough investigation to elicit information about the manner in which the subject crime had been committed and the complicity of the co-accused, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. The Court is required to



see that an order of anticipatory bail does not operate as inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. It is well settled that Court must be circumspect while exercising such power for grant of pre-arrest bail and it should not be granted as a matter of rule and has to be granted only when the Court is convinced that exceptional circumstances exist to resort to that extra ordinary remedy. In the instant case, however, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

7. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Since the main petition has been dismissed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

[MANISHA BATRA]
JUDGE

20th November, 2025

Parveen Sharma

1. *Whether speaking/ reasoned*

: *Yes / No*

2. *Whether reportable*

: *Yes / No*