

2026:PHHC:076092



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

207

CRM-M No.20509 of 2026
Date of decision: 14.05.2026

Mandeep Kaur ... Petitioner
Vs.
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Pratham Sethi, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Roshandeep Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent.

Mr. Vishal Deep Goyal, Advocate and
Mr. Mandeep Budhiraja, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
67	28.02.2026	Sadar Ferozepur, District Ferozepur	108 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNS”)

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of

2026:PHHC:076092



statement recorded by the complainant Darbara Singh alleging therein that his elder son Gagandeep Singh was married with the petitioner in the year 2015 and three children were born out of his loins. He had separated from the complainant in the year 2020 and had started residing with his family in a nearby house. He alleged that the petitioner who is a Punjab Police employee, used to quarrel with her husband quiet often. She even used to call her father and one unknown person to her house for the purpose of assaulting her husband. On 20.02.2026 also, she called her father and unknown person to her house. All of them extended beatings to Gagandeep Singh due to which he was highly perturbed. Gagandeep Singh used to share the treatment meted out at the hands of the petitioner and her father etc. and had told the complainant that he had been extended threats by them. On 22.02.2026 also, the petitioner after quarrelling with Gagandeep Singh extended threats to him to call her family members. Due to distress and fear, her son consumed some poisonous substance. He was taken to hospital but had died during the course of treatment on 27.02.2026. By alleging that the petitioner and her father etc. were responsible for homicidal death of the victim, he prayed for taking action in the matter.

3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which was dismissed by the

2026:PHHC:076092



Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ferozepur vide order dated 24.03.2026.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. The deceased who was her husband was a drug addict. He ended his own life by consuming some poisonous substance. He was unemployed. There is delay in reporting the matter to the police which has not been explained at all. Neither any suicide note has been left by the deceased nor there is any dying declaration. The ingredients for commission of offence punishable under Section 108 of BNS are not at all attracted qua her. She is ready to join investigation. Her custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from her. It is, thus, argued that she deserves to be extended benefit of pre arrest bail.

5. Learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. The CCTV footage collected during investigation prima facie corroborates the allegations of the father of the deceased assaulting the deceased and the petitioner facilitating the assault by handing over a stick to her father thereby demonstrating her active participation and instigation in the occurrence. For conducting proper and thorough investigation in the matter, her custodial interrogation is required. There is no exceptional circumstance to extend benefit of pre arrest bail to her.

2026:PHHC:076092



It is, therefore, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner along with the co-accused is alleged to have abetted suicide by the deceased by getting her physically assaulted not only by her father but by herself also repeatedly. The CCTV footage collected during the course of investigation prima facie verifies this fact. The allegations against the petitioner are specific and serious in nature. The case is at its nascent stage. For conducting thorough and proper investigation in the matter, her custodial interrogation is must. In case, the same is denied to the investigation agency, that shall leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, adversely affecting the investigation. Refusal of pre arrest bail depends upon the various circumstances, the cumulative effect of which enters the judicial verdict. The Court has also to see that an order of anticipatory bail should not operate as an inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. It is well settled proposition of law that powers for grant of pre arrest bail are not to be exercised in a routine manner but in extraordinary and sparing circumstances. In the present case, no such exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

2026:PHHC:076092



8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

14.05.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No