



CRM-M-17477 of 2026

-1-

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

211

CRM-M-17477 of 2026
Date of Decision: 16.04.2026

Rani Kaur @ Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Raghav Soni, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.10 dated 10.01.2026 registered under Sections 103, 238 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused, had murdered Kashmir Kaur (daughter of the complainant). Hence, the present FIR.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and she has no concern with the death of Kashmir Kaur. He further argued that the petitioner has been falsely roped in the present case only because of the reason that she is the

**CRM-M-17477 of 2026****-2-**

mother-in-law of the deceased. He argued that Kashmir Kaur died a natural death on 27.12.2025 and there is no material on record to suggest any homicidal death. He submitted that the essential ingredients of offences alleged are completely missing and the FIR has been registered merely on conjectures and surmises. He argued that as per the prosecution, the petitioner along with co-accused after murdering the deceased, had disposed off her body without informing the family of the complainant, which is totally false and frivolous. He argued that the petitioner and other co-accused has duly informed the complainant family about the demise of Kashmir Kaur. He submitted that the petitioner along with co-accused, being the in-laws, performed the last rites and all religious ceremonies of the deceased openly in the village in the presence of the villagers. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as she is not involved in any other case. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Sessions Judge, Amritsar, vide order dated 07.03.2026.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel has already filed the status report in the matter, which is taken on record and while referring to the same, he has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR. He



further argued that the petitioner along with other co-accused had murdered Kashmir Kaur and thereafter, cremated her dead body and dispose the ashes in Ravi River and as such, actively participated in the crime. He further argued that the investigation is at crucial stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the modus operandi as well as to take the investigation to its logical end. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Heard.

7. In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and she is specifically named in the FIR and the petitioner along with other co-accused committed the murder of the deceased and thereafter, cremated her dead body without informing her parents. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the *modus operandi* as well as to take the investigation to its logical end, which so far indicates involvement of the petitioner in the alleged crime. This Court is sanguine of the fact that while considering the petition for anticipatory bail, it is required to consider the overall nature of offence and accusation against the accused, the manner of occurrence, the gravity of offence and the potential impact of granting pre-arrest protection, at this stage. Granting anticipatory bail with such allegations, at this preliminary stage, would not be justified as it may affect the course of fair investigation and undermine the seriousness of the alleged act. Considering the gravity of the allegations, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation in the matter.

8. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding



individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

9. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it

**CRM-M-17477 of 2026****-5-**

will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

10. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

16.04.2026
D.Bansal

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