



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

**CRM-M-22252-2026  
Date of decision: 22.04.2026**

**KARAMJEET KAUR @ KARAMJIT KAUR**

**...PETITIONER**

**V/S**

**STATE OF PUNJAB**

**...RESPONDENT**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present: Mr. Kartik Gandhi, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

**\*\*\*\***

**SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)**

1. Through the instant petition filed under Section 482 Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, prayer is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.71 dated 04.04.2026 registered under Sections 110, 118(1), 115(2), 351(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Dakha, District Ludhiana.

2. Allegations against the present petitioner are that she hit the complainant i.e. her husband, who was on a two-wheeler, with her vehicle (car make 'Scorpio'), when she was travelling with her paramour, namely Tarandeep Singh. Resultantly, the complainant fell off the motor-cycle and sustained injuries. Hence, the present FIR was registered.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that genesis of the present matter is a matrimonial dispute between the parties as petitioner is wife of the complainant; on the day of occurrence, the complainant tried to stop the vehicle by putting his motor-cycle in front of car, in which, petitioner



along with her colleague were sitting and tried to make a video of moving car; in this process, he fell down and sustained injuries; earlier also, the complainant extended threats to the petitioner for committing suicide, video clip of the same is available with the petitioner; petitioner is serving as police constable in Punjab Police and is having clean and clear antecedents; petitioner is a pregnant lady and nothing is to be recovered from her possession, therefore her custodial interrogation is not required; the petitioner is ready to join the investigation and co-operate with the investigating agency. Hence, learned counsel prayed for relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel appeared on advance notice and submitted that complainant sustained total 09 injuries and medical opinion regarding nature of injuries is yet to be received.

5. Mr. Vaibhav Sehgal, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his power of attorney. The same is taken on record. Learned counsel opposed the prayer made by the petitioner by submitting that when petitioner and co-accused, were caught going together in a car, by the complainant, they tried to run over their vehicle on the complainant, and hit his motor-cycle with the car driven by petitioner, due to which, complainant fell down and received serious injuries in the incident.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case and contentions of learned counsel for the parties that it is not a disputed fact that complainant while travelling on a two wheeler, was hit by the petitioner's vehicle (car make 'Scorpio'), and the complainant received injuries; it is a moot question to be considered at the time of trial whether the



petitioner intentionally hit the complainant or it was an accident as complainant repeatedly tried to stop the petitioner by driving ahead of her; petitioner is a Police Constable serving in Punjab Police and she is a pregnant lady; petitioner is having clean and clear antecedents and is not involved in any other criminal activity, therefore, taking into consideration the totality of circumstances, this Court finds merit in the present petition.

8. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so. In the event of her arrest, the petitioner shall be admitted to bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of investigating/arresting officer and shall also abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS (*erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.*).

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be expression of an opinion by this Court on merits of the case.

April 22, 2026  
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)  
JUDGE

|      |                           |        |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable        | Yes/No |