



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

122

CRM-M-15347-2025(O&M)

Date of decision: 10.03.2026

Amandeep Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. C.S. Jattana, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate for complainant.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner(s) in case bearing FIR No.161 dated 22.07.2024, registered under Section(s) 103, 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa.

2. A status report filed by way of an affidavit dated 20.04.2025 on behalf of respondent-State is already available on file. Another status report by way of affidavit dated 09.03.2026 on behalf of respondent(s)-State has also been filed by the learned State counsel today in the Court. Both the status reports are taken on record.

3. The FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of Lakhvir Singh son of Labh Singh (deceased herein). Initially, the FIR was registered against some unknown persons on the allegation that on 22.07.2024, the complainant's father, Labh Singh, was found dead with injuries on his face and head caused by a sharp edged weapon, which were

allegedly inflicted by some unidentified persons. Subsequently, in the evening, a supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded, wherein it was alleged that upon making his own inquiries, he came to learn that Amandeep Kaur, the wife of his brother Baldeep Singh, was allegedly involved in an illicit relationship with Mandeep Singh @ Bhushan, son of Ramesh Kumar and the said aspect had come to the knowledge of the deceased-Labh Singh. It was further alleged that apprehending that the deceased might disclose their alleged relationship to other members of the family, the petitioner, along with her co-accused Mandeep Singh @ Bhushan, conspired and committed the murder of Labh Singh.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the prosecution's case rests entirely on circumstantial evidence and that no person has witnessed the occurrence in question. It is contended that the investigation primarily relies upon the Call Detail Records (CDRs) of the mobile numbers allegedly used by the petitioner and co-accused Mandeep Singh @ Bhushan, however, the said CDRs, by themselves, do not establish that the petitioner was complicit in, or a conspirator to, the alleged elimination of Labh Singh. He contends that moreover, the call records do not corroborate that on the day of the incident, when the alleged occurrence took place, the petitioner was in conversation with the co-accused/Mandeep Singh @ Bhushan. Learned counsel further submits that the recoveries effected during investigation do not support the prosecution version. It is pointed out that the prosecution has allegedly recovered a wooden baton/log, whereas the Post-Mortem Report reflects that the deceased sustained incised wounds. One such injury is described as an incised wound with clear

margins measuring 20 cm in length, 3 cm in breadth and 3.5 cm in depth, located on the left temporal region of the skull. Another injury is stated to be an incised wound over the pinna, resulting in severance of the cartilage. Counsel submits that such injuries are ordinarily caused by a sharp-edged weapon and the wooden log allegedly recovered at the instance of co-accused Mandeep Singh @ Bhushan could not have caused such incised wounds. He contends that the petitioner has been nominated as an accused in the present case without any corroborating evidence linking her to the commission of the offence and that she has been in custody since 23.07.2024 and that the investigation in the case already stands completed. He submits that only 01 out of the total 29 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far and the trial is likely to take a long time to conclude. It is also contended that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

5. Learned counsel for respondent-State reiterates his submission that as per the investigation conducted and the CDRs collected during the course thereof, the petitioner was in an illicit relationship with co-accused/Mandeep Singh @ Bhushan and that with a view to eliminate any probable threat of disclosure, the petitioner, in collusion with the co-accused, eliminated him. He however is not in a position to offer any satisfactory explanation, at this stage, as to whether the alleged weapon recovered during investigation could have caused the incised wounds found on the person of the deceased, as reflected in the post-mortem report. He is also not in a position to refer to any evidence, at this stage, so as to establish that on the date of the occurrence, the petitioner was in active communication or collusion with co-accused Mandeep Singh @ Bhushan so as to orchestrate

the alleged murder of Labh Singh.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the facts and circumstances noted above, including the period of actual custody undergone by the petitioner, her clean antecedents, absence of any recovery from her, the stage of the trial wherein only 01 out of the total 29 prosecution witnesses has been examined so far coupled with the fact that the allegation against the petitioner are of conspiratorial nature and that arguable issues with respect to her involvement in the offence would arise for consideration of the trial court and bearing in mind that the conclusion of the trial is likely to take a long time, I deem it fit to allow the instant petition.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be admitted to regular bail subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the trial Court/Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate concerned.

8. It is made clear that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

9. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the trial Court shall decide the case on the basis of available material.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

10.03.2026

Mangal Singh

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