



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-7197-2026
DECIDED ON: 18.05.2026

DALJIT KAURPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Mr. A.S. Kler, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. S.S. Ranghi, Sr. Advocate and
Mr. Fateh Sanota, Advocate for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Daljit Kaur	41	20.05.2025	103, 109, 118(2), 3(5) of BNS and Section 27/54/59 of Arms Act	Kheri Gandian	Patiala

FIR registered at the instance of complainant Darshan Singh follows as:-



“Stated that I am a resident of the above mentioned address and doing agricultural work. Jagdeep Singh son of Late Rajinder Singh, resident of Bhogla is his uncle in relation. The house of Amrinder Singh @ Gogi son of Karnail Singh is adjacent to the house of Jagdeep Singh and street stands closed in front of the house of Amrinder Singh and there was water leakage of drinking water pipe in front of the house of his uncle Kuldeep Singh son of late Ajaib Singh and a pit was dug to repair the same. The accused Arminder Asingh A and his wife Daljit Kaur used to abuse his (uncle Jagdeep Singh and other family members due to the pit in the street and used to say that you have put dirt on the road. Today my uncle Jagdeep Singh called me and my brother Amarjit Singh son of Late Ajaib Singh and Harjot Singh son of Kuldeep Singh and Randhir Singh son of Gurdeep Singh, residents of village Bhogla and told that that Arminder Singh and his wife Daljit Kaur were harassing and abusing us. Upon which we all reached the street in front of Jagdeep Singh house and we saw that the said Arminder Singh and his wife Daljit Kaur were abusing Jagdeep Singh and his/family in front of the gate of their house, in the street. On which we tried to make understand Arminder Singh and his wife Daljit Kaur, but Arminder Singh and his wife Daljit Kaur did not listen to us, but even became more angry and Arminder Singh's wife started saying her husband Arminder Singh to get rid of them today, As soon as we saw them, he brought a 12-bore gun from inside his house along with a belt with a round and handed it her husband Arminder Singh and Arminder Singh took out two round from the belt and loaded it into the 12 bore gun he was holding in his hand, then the time would be around 6.30 P. M. On which Daljit Kaur said to her husband Arminder Singh that now what are you watching, do it, on which Arminder Singh fired the first shot which hit Amarjit Singh on the back and his daughter Khushpreet Kaur standing in front, causing



Amarjit Singh to fall down. When Jagdeep Singh and Harjot Singh went forward to pick up Amarjit Singh, Arminder Singh fired the second shot which hit Jagdeep Singh and Harjot Singh. We raised alarm of Marta Marta, then Arminder Singh and his wife Daljit Kaur fled from the spot with the weapon in their hands while abusing. Then I and Randhir Singh with the help of my family members arranged vehicles and took Amarjit Singh, Jagdeep Singh, Khushpreet Kaur and Harjot Singh to A.P. Jain, Civil Hospital, Rajpura treatment, where the doctor declared Amarjit Singh as dead and considering the condition of Jagdeep Singh, Harjot Singh and Khushpreet Kaur, referred them to PGI Chandigarh for treatment. We admitted them to PGI Chandigarh through a private ambulance. I along with Randhir Singh was coming to the police station to inform you, we came to know that you had already reached at the spot village Bhogla alongwith police party where I got recorded my statement in the presence of Randhir Singh. I read it and heard it and it is correct. Appropriate legal action should be taken against Arminder Singh and his wife Daljit Kaur. Sd/- Darshan Singh.”

2. Short reply by way of affidavit of Daljit Singh Virk, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Circle Ghanour, District Patiala on behalf of respondent i.e. State of Punjab has been filed in the Court and the same is taken on record.
3. Mr. Fateh Sanota, Advocate, has made appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed Vakalatnama, which is taken on record.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that deceased in the present case is Amarjit Singh. Furthermore, three individuals namely Jagdeep Singh, Khushpreet Kaur (daughter of the deceased) and Harjot Singh are injured in the present case. On 19.05.2025 the incident in question took place



on a small issue of leakage of water from drinking water pipeline in front of the house of complainant's uncle, Kuldeep Singh where a pit had been dug to repair the same.

As per allegations, accused Amrinder Singh had fired two shots with 12 bore gun and it was petitioner who provoked her husband Amrinder Singh and also handed over the 12 bore gun alongwith cartridges by bringing the same from inside of the house.

5. Counsel for the petitioner argues that petitioner is a household woman, having a minor son aged about 5 years old and there is no one else except of remote relations to look after the said child. He further submits that no active role is attributed to petitioner except of bald allegations that she had provoked her husband and also brought 12 bore gun alongwith cartridges from inside the house and then handover it to the main accused Amrinder Singh.

He further submits that, whether the role assigned to the petitioner is true or false, is yet to be established by the prosecution by proving beyond doubt the kind of allegations levelled against her. However, she being not the main accused, nor alleged to be armed with any weapon and presently lying inside jail for the last about a period of 11 months and 24 days (since 23.05.2025) thus prays for her release on bail.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the prayer and submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that petitioner is equally responsible as her husband Arminder Singh @ Gogi as of now, once allegations are therewith active role played by her that it was petitioner, who went inside the house and then handed over the weapons alongwith cartridges to her co-accused husband-Arminder Singh. He further submits that as per the allegations in the FIR earlier to the incident also, it was



the petitioner who used to fight with Jagdeep Singh on the small issues regarding the leakage in the drinking water pipeline.

7. Learned Senior counsel for the complaint also opposing the bail, submitted that the petitioner is equally liable for the incident, sharing common intention with the main accused Armrinder Singh @ Gogi. He further submits that if she had not brought the weapon from the house; the said incident could have been avoided. Although none of the counsel for the non-petitioner, disputes the fact that petitioner is not alleged to be armed with any weapon or that she is not involved in any other case or involving in the criminal activity, it is also admitted that the petitioner is mother of a minor child aged about 5 years and her company is very much needed by the child of that age.

8. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the relevant material on record with their able assistance including the fact that petitioner is a woman and in normal case it is not expected that she would not be capable to influence upon the witnesses for weakening the case of the prosecution and her presence is also required to look after her minor child.

9. In view of totality of circumstances and the fact discussed above, in addition to incarceration period of about 11 months and 23 days already having been suffered by her for the act attributed to her. I deem it appropriate to consider the plea of the bail of the petitioner.

10. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

11. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. Any of the discussion done and recorded here above, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.

13. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioner is directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.

14. Petition stands disposed of.

18.05.2026
mahima

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>