



104

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

**CRM-M-17592-2026
DECIDED ON: 02.04.2026**

MANDEEP KAUR**.....PETITIONER**

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB**.....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.**

Present: Mr. Amandeep Sing Manaise, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. P.P.S. Mahl, Advocate,
for complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.21, dated 30.01.2026, under Sections 103, 61(2), 191(3), 190 of BNS (old sections 302, 120-B, 148, 149 IPC) and sections 25, 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Ajnala, District Amritsar Rural.

2. FIR in question has been registered on the statement of complainant namely Parminder Kaur, which reads as under:-

“I am a resident of the above-mentioned address and a homemaker. My marriage was deceased solemnized about 15 years ago with Avtar Singh, son of Nachhattar Singh, resident of Ward No.04, Ajnala. We have two children. An elder daughter Satseerat Kaur aged 9 years and a younger son Avalnoor Singh aged 7 years. My husband Avtar Singh had arranged the marriage of Mandeep Kaur, daughter of Satnam

Singh, resident of Anantpura (who is the daughter of my husband's maternal uncle), with Sukhdayal Singh, son of Pratap Singh, resident of Ward No.09, Ajnala (who is related to me as my paternal uncle-in-law), about 20 years ago. Sukhdayal Singh is a retired army employee and is currently working in Adampur, District Hoshiarpur. Mandeep Kaur developed illicit relations with Harpinder Singh @ Heera Singh, son of Sukhbir Singh, resident of Nangal Sohal, presently residing at Fatehgarh Road, Ajnala. My husband Avtar Singh shared this matter with the entire family and expressed concern about defamation. He also tried to restrain Mandeep Kaur from such activities. About 10-15 days ago, Mandeep Kaur came to our house and argued with my husband and said: "Who are you to interfere in my life? If you do not stop interfering, you will face consequences." On 29.01.2026 at about 5:30 PM, my husband received a phone call. He hurriedly left the house on his motorcycle (make Splendor), telling me that Mandeep Kaur had called him. I and my mother-in-law Nirmal Kaur became worried and around 6:00 PM we reached Mandeep Kaur's house. There we saw Mandeep Kaur, wife of Sukhdayal Singh, and Harpinder Singh @ Heera Singh who had a pistol in his hand, along with three other unknown persons. On seeing us, they got nervous and fled from the spot in a vehicle bearing No.PB 10-FU-7400, make Innova Crysta, dark grey in color. When we entered the lobby of Mandeep Kaur's house, we saw my husband lying face down on the floor, covered in blood. We lifted him and found him unconscious. Blood was oozing from his ears, head, and nose. We arranged transport and took him to Gulati Hospital, Ajnala, where the doctor examined him in the vehicle itself and declared him dead. Mandeep Kaur, Harpinder Singh @ Heera Singh, and three other unidentified persons (whom I can identify if produced) have, in furtherance of a conspiracy and common intention, murdered my husband. The reason is that my husband was a man of honor and used to restrain Mandeep Kaur from her illicit relationship with Harpinder Singh @ Heera Singh, due to which they committed his murder. I am the complainant and request legal action. Statement written, read over, and found correct."

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that name of the petitioner has been unnecessarily introduced in the FIR and no specific role has been attributed to her.

It is further argued that reliance on the CCTV footage does not support the prosecution's case, as it neither depicts presence of the petitioner, nor shows any co-accused fleeing from the spot in the manner alleged by the complainant.

It is also contended that the CCTV footage fails to establish that complainant even reached the spot, as alleged in the FIR.

4. This Court has heard the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and has carefully perused the allegations contained in the FIR.

5. A holistic consideration of the facts reveals that petitioner is the underlying cause behind the commission of murder of Avtar Singh. Although, the actual act of crime might have been carried out by Harpinder Singh @ Heera Singh, but dispute is stated to have arisen on account of the petitioner residing with him, despite there being her marital relation with Sukhdayal Singh, who was posted elsewhere.

6. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, this Court does not find any sufficient ground to extend the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, which is an extraordinary relief, particularly in a case involving the offence of murder. **Accordingly, present petition stands dismissed.**

02.04.2026

Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

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