



In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh

Criminal Misc. No. M-13043 of 2026

Date of Decision: 28.04.2026

Sapna alias Sapna Motton

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.

Present: Mr.Karanvir Singh Khehar, Mr. Prandeep Kurhar
and Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocates for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Eklavya Darshi, Deputy Advocate General,
Punjab, for the respondent.

Dr. S.K. Passi and Ms. Honey Passi, Advocates
for the complainant.

Surya Partap Singh, J.

1. This petition for anticipatory bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 21 dated 19.02.2026, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 108 of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023' Police Station Model Town, District Hoshiarpur, Punjab.

2. Vide order dated 10.03.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

3. Heard.

4. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 10.03.2026, the petitioner has already joined

the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 10.03.2026 be made absolute.

5. The learned State counsel, in response to above-mentioned contentions, has conceded, on the instructions from 'ASI Deepankar Singh', that the petitioner has joined investigation, and that for further investigation of this case his custodial interrogation is not required.

6. The learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above-mentioned arguments addressed by the learned State counsel vis-a-vis learned counsel for the petitioner. It has been contended by learned counsel for the complainant that in the present case false information has been given by the Investigating Officer, with regard to communication between the petitioner and the deceased.

7. The record has been perused carefully.

8. Keeping in view the facts & circumstances of the present case, in my opinion, following are the relevant factors which are supposed to be taken into consideration:-

- i) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation;
- ii) that it is an admitted fact that the petitioner was living separately from the deceased 'Rajesh Kumar' much before the incident in question;
- iii) that the petitioner being a lady deserves a considerate view;
- iv) that nothing has to be recovered from the possession of petitioner;

- v) that the investigation and trial of the case are not likely to be concluded in near future;
- vi) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- vii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
- viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

9. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, it is hereby ordered that the petitioner is entitled for anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is hereby **allowed** and the order dated 10.03.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

April 28, 2026
“DK”

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