

2026 PHHC-076870



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

206

CRM-M-23293 of 2026 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 14.05.2026

Harpreet Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present: Mr. Ankur Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Kathuria, DAG., Punjab.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No. 39 dated 14.02.2026, registered under Sections 80 and 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 (corresponding Sections 304-B and 120-B IPC), at Police Station Beas, District Amritsar (Rural).

2. The present FIR came to be registered on the statement made by the sister of the deceased, who alleged that the marriage of her sister was solemnized about three years back with one Jagjit Singh. However, soon after the marriage, Jagjit Singh-husband of the deceased and the other members of the matrimonial family started physically and mentally harassing and torturing the deceased on the pretext that she had not brought sufficient dowry at the time of marriage and further started raising demands

for dowry. It was further alleged that since the father of the deceased had already expired, the complainant kept on approaching the respectables and relatives in order to resolve the matrimonial dispute so that her sister could peacefully settle in her matrimonial home. It was further alleged that about two to three months prior to the occurrence, Jagjit Singh had given beatings to the deceased and turned her out of the matrimonial home, and thereafter, mother-in-law, father-in-law and sister-in-law, had sent Jagjit Singh abroad without even informing the deceased. It has further been alleged that on 14.02.2026, the complainant received a call from her sister between 8:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., wherein she disclosed that the present petitioner (i.e., sister-in-law) had come to her parental house and that the whole family had been passing comments against her. The deceased allegedly stated that she was deeply disturbed due to the conduct of the entire matrimonial family and that it would be better for her to die rather than continue living in such an atmosphere. It was further alleged that on the next day at about 4:30 p.m., the complainant received information that the dead body of her sister was lying in the fields situated behind her matrimonial home. Upon reaching the spot, she found a cable wire lying near the head of the deceased. Allegations have also been levelled against the present petitioner along with the other co-accused persons that they acted in connivance with each other and subjected the deceased to harassment and cruelty, which allegedly resulted in her death.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner has vehemently argued that the petitioner herself is a married woman and had married against the wishes of her parental family and, on account thereof,

had virtually been disowned by them. It has been submitted that she had no regular connection or participation in the affairs of her parental family. Learned counsel further submitted that even at the time of the marriage of her brother with the deceased, the petitioner was not invited and did not attend the marriage ceremony. It has been argued that the prosecution is attempting to falsely project cordial relations between the petitioner and the deceased merely on the basis of certain chats exchanged between them.

4. It has further been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the chats relied upon by the prosecution would rather show that both of them intended to meet each other and shared normal relations. However, according to the learned counsel, the petitioner could not meet the deceased on the relevant date as after waiting for a considerable period the deceased did not turn up and unfortunately, on the very next day, the deceased committed suicide. Learned counsel, therefore, submitted that the petitioner had no role whatsoever in the alleged occurrence and her implication is only on account of her relationship with the family of the husband of the deceased, being the sister of the husband.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State has opposed the present petition and submitted that there are specific allegations against the petitioner regarding her active participation in subjecting the deceased to mental and physical cruelty. It has been argued that the allegations cannot be brushed aside merely because the petitioner was living separately after her own marriage. It has further been submitted that the investigation is still at a crucial stage and custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary not only for recovery of jewellery articles but also for proper confrontation with

the other accused persons so as to unearth the true facts surrounding the unnatural death of the deceased.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

7. The allegations in the present case pertain to the death of a young married woman within the matrimonial fold after just three years of her marriage. At the present stage, the material collected during investigation prima facie reflects allegations regarding continuous harassment and cruelty meted out to the deceased. The contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner that she had strained relations with her parental family and was not even invited to the marriage of her brother are such matters which would require appreciation during the course of investigation and trial. Similarly, the nature and effect of the chats between the petitioner and the deceased would also be a matter of evidentiary assessment at an appropriate stage.

8. At this stage, this Court cannot lose sight of the fact that the investigation is still in progress and the prosecution has specifically asserted the necessity of custodial interrogation of the petitioner for effective investigation and recovery.

9. The allegations in the present case are serious in nature and relate to offences arising out of alleged matrimonial cruelty leading to the eventual death of the victim. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, the stage of investigation, and the requirement of custodial interrogation for effective investigation, this Court does not find any exceptional circumstances warranting the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. Without commenting further on the merits of the case, lest it prejudice either side during investigation or trial, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner does not deserve the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail.

11. Consequently, the present petition is dismissed.

12. Nothing construed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

13. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

14.05.2026

s.khan

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No