

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026.PHHC.078267



(103)

CRM-M-4653-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 19.05.2026
Uploaded on: 19.05.2026

Manjit KaurPetitioner(s)

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. G.K. Mann, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arshjot S. Mohi, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. G.S. Jossan, Advocate for the complainant.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0338 dated 22.12.2025 registered under Sections 105, 61(2) and 324(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.
2. On 28.01.2026, the following order was passed:

“Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in case FIR No.0338 dated 22.12.2025 registered under

Sections 105, 61(2) and 324(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station Jandiala, District Amritsar Rural.

Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that the petitioner, who is a senior citizen of the age of 82 years, is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The complainant is the sister-in-law of the petitioner and earlier there was a dispute with regard to the property, which has been settled vide panchayati compromise dated 18.09.2025 (Annexure P-1), and the instant FIR has been registered after ten days of the alleged incident. She further submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other case and he is ready and willing to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and seeks time to file status report. Mr. G.S. Jossan, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of the complainant through video-conferencing.

In the meanwhile, arrest of the petitioner shall remain stayed. She shall join the investigation and co-operate with the investigating agency and shall not leave the country without prior permission of the Court.”

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions from SI Baljeet Singh) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation and is not required for custodial interrogation.

3.1. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that she may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the witnesses and also the FIR-complainant.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the rival parties and upon perusal of the record; especially keeping in view the factum of the

petitioner having joined investigation and she is not required for custodial interrogation; this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 28.01.2026.

4.1. *Ergo*, the petition in hand is allowed and the order dated 28.01.2026 is made absolute.

5. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting 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. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

7. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

19.05.2026

Naveen

**(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Yes/No

Whether Reportable :

Yes/No