

2026:PHHC:036830



213 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-2987-2026
Date of Decision:10.03.2026

Gurjit Kaur alias Guriyet Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab ...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY

Present: Ms. Prabhjot Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Gurdeep Singh, AAG, Punjab.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (ORAL)

1. By virtue of the present petition under Section 482 BNSS, petitioners, co-accused in case bearing FIR No.267 dated 13.11.2025 registered under Sections 108 BNS, at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda, have prayed for grant of pre-arrest bail.

2. Status report dated 15.02.2026 by way of affidavit of Mr. Harvinder Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rural Bathinda, has been filed. The same is taken on record. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI, Chamkor Singh, states that the petitioner have joined the investigation and are not needed for any further investigation.

3. On 24.02.2026, following order was passed by this Court:-

This petition for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 BNSS, has been filed by petitioners, accused in case bearing FIR No.267 dated 13.11.2025 registered against them and others at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda, for the

commission of offences punishable u/s 108 of BNS.

Relevant facts as can be inferred from the documents on record are noticed hereinbelow:-

Gurdeep Kaur, w/o late Major Singh, a home maker, r/o Ward No.1, Tungwali Road, Village Kotshamir, District Bathinda, set the criminal law in motion by filing a complaint pointing therein that she had two children; elder daughter named Gurmeet Kaur, who is married and residing in Khattwara, District Sirsa and younger son, namely, Lakhvir Singh (since deceased) aged about 42 years, who was working as a driver. Lakhvir Singh had been married to Kirandeep Kaur, d/o Jagraj Singh about 09 years ago. The couple has two sons. Unfortunately, there was a matrimonial discord between Lakhvir Singh (since deceased) and his wife Kirandeep Kaur. About 03 months ago, Kirandeep Kaur's mother, namely, Charanjit Kaur accompanied by Gurjit Kaur @ Gurjeet Kaur (petitioner No.1) (daughter of maternal uncle of Kirandeep Kaur) and Paramjit Kaur @ Paramjeet Kaur @ Jassi Kaur (petitioner No.2) (wife of maternal uncle of Kirandeep Kaur) were visiting her. Instead of sorting out the dispute between husband and wife, the above-mentioned ladies took away Kirandeep Kaur and both the children with them. Since then, Lakhvir Singh used to remain under depression. While leaving, Kirandeep Kaur also took with her seven and half tolas of gold. Many a times, complainant-party visited the parental home of Kirandeep Kaur and requested her to return back to the matrimonial home but all their efforts went in vain. Complainant next alleges that on the instigation of above mentioned three ladies, her daughter-in-law Kirandeep Kaur presented a complaint against her son Lakhvir Singh, who received a notice, to join the inquiry proceedings on 13.11.2025. She also had to accompany her son but could not do so as she had gone to meet her daughter. On the day in question, her son Lakhvir Singh was alone at home. In the afternoon, she received the tragic news that her son Lakhvir Singh had committed suicide by consuming poisonous substance. Immediately thereafter, she reached her

home with relatives and saw dead body of her son lying on the bed in his room. Towards the end, complainant alleges that being fed-up of harassment perpetrated upon him by his wife Kirandeep Kaur and her relatives (mentioned-above), Lakhvir Singh committed suicide. Primarily with this backdrop, complainant requested the police authorities to catch hold of all those, who were involved in the unfortunate death of her son, as also to initiate appropriate criminal proceedings against them.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioners, who are the cousin sister and aunt of daughter-in-law of complainant, have been falsely implicated in the present case. Even if the contents of the complaint are taken to be true at their face-value (though not admitted), only bald general allegations have been levelled against them. No specific role/overt-act has been attributed to them. Further, if the sequence of events had unfolded in the manner as suggested by complainant, there is nothing on record to draw an inference that after the wife of deceased left the matrimonial home, allegedly at the instance of present petitioners and her mother, deceased moved any complaint to any of the authorities or initiated any other legal proceeding. That apart, no positive overt-act on the part of petitioners in close proximity with the death of the deceased has been highlighted by the complainant in her complaint from where it can be inferred that petitioners instigated deceased and brought him to such a situation in life where he had no other option but to bring an end to his life; there being no suicide note of deceased. Thus, it is apparent that petitioners have been falsely arrayed only with a view to harass them, as also to extract illegal monetary benefit from them. Nonetheless, they are ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called for by the Investigating Officer.

Learned counsel has placed reliance upon the following judgments:-

(i) “Jayedeepsinh Pravinsinh Chavda and others Vs. State of Gujarat” (2025(1) RCR (Criminal) 169) passed by the Hon’ble

Supreme Court,

(ii) “Malkeet Kaur Vs. State of Haryana”, Law Finder Doc ID#2648146 passed by this Court and

(iii) “Devender Vs. State of Haryana”, Law Finder Doc ID #2754271 passed by this Court.

Per contra, while opposing the request for grant of pre-arrest bail, learned State counsel accompanied by Ms. Prabhjot Kaur, learned counsel appearing for complainant, by referring to the status report dated 15.02.2026 filed by way of affidavit of Mr. Harvinder Singh, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Rural, Bathinda on behalf of respondent-State, contend that petitioners, who are close relatives of wife of deceased, had compelled her to leave the matrimonial home and were also not allowing her (Kirandeep Kaur) to return back to stay with her husband and in-laws. They were time and again instigating the wife of deceased to leave the matrimonial home. Acting on their advise, she left the home and refused to return back. Further, it was at the asking of the present petitioners that wife of the deceased moved a complaint against him levelling baseless allegations. The matter was being enquired into by the police authorities and deceased was feeling quite let down in front of his family, friends, relatives etc. On one such weak moment, when he was alone at home, feeling fed up of the frivolous allegations levelled by his wife, at the instance of the petitioners, he took the drastic step of consuming poison. Thus, as per both the learned counsel, petitioners have played an active/constructive role in the entire incident.

Heard. Documents on record perused.

In view of the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners but without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, petitioners are hereby directed to join investigation within seven days from today and co-operate in the same. In the event of the arrest of the petitioners, they shall be released on interim bail on their furnishing personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. They

shall also abide by conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.

Adjourned to 10.03.2026.”

4. Keeping in view the fact that petitioner has joined the investigation, interim bail granted vide order dated 24.02.2026 is hereby confirmed, subject to conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS. 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; he will not tamper with the evidence nor will influence the witnesses and will not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.
5. The petition stands allowed.
6. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

10.03.2026
Parveen kumar

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

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