



CRM-M-26504-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-26504-2026

Date of Decision: 15.05.2026

Surinder Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Sr. Advocate with
Ms.Gaganbir Kaur Kahlon, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Kuljinder Dhindsa, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.161 dated 15.12.2025, registered under Sections 308(5), 326(F), 326(7), 61(2), 111 of BNS, 2023 and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Majitha, District Amritsar Rural.

2. Succinctly, the facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was registered on the statement of the complainant, namely, Kawaljit Singh. It was alleged that he was doing the business of sale and purchase of old vehicles and he was also got preparing restaurant at Sohian Road, where he used to kept the vehicles and other goods and he had deputed a security guard, namely, Davinder Singh at that place. On 14.12.2025, complainant was present in his house where Security Guard Davinder Singh came present and informed the complainant that 6 unidentified persons, who came on two motorcycles and set on fire 2 vehicles belonging to the complainant. Complainant also informed to the police that on 21.10.2025 he received a threat call of extortion of Rs.50,00,000/- and he has firm belief that present occurrence was committed by those unknown persons who demanded ransom of Rs.50,00,000/- from him. Thus, request was made to take legal



CRM-M-26504-2026

-2-

action against the accused persons. On the registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and she was arrested on 20.12.2025. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, learned Court declined the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 23.04.2026. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court by way of filing the present petition praying for the grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He contends that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR, nor any overt act has been attributed to her. He submits that after the registration of the FIR, two supplementary statements were recorded by the complainant, however, the petitioner was not named in those supplementary statements. He submits that admittedly, the petitioner was behind the bars on the date of occurrence of the present case in a case FIR No.328 dated 02.11.2025 and this Court had granted bail to her in that FIR vide order dated 22.04.2026. He contends that false implication of the petitioner is writ large. He submits that there is no admissible evidence available with the prosecution for showing her complicity in the present case. He contends that as the petitioner is the mother of co-accused Aman, it is only on the basis of the same, the petitioner has been roped in the present case. He, thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.



4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. He submits that complicity of the petitioner was surfaced during the investigation. She in conspiracy with co-accused i.e. her son Aman made the extortion calls to the complainant for giving Rs.50 lacs as ransom and thereafter, the vehicles of the complainant were burnt by the co-accused. On instructions, he has submitted that challan has been presented and charges are yet to be framed. He has filed the custody certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR nor he was named in the supplementary statements recorded by the complainant. Admittedly, she was behind the bars in another case at the time of occurrence in the present case and she was granted bail in that case by this Court vide order dated 22.04.2026. As per custody certificate of the petitioner, he has already suffered incarceration of 04 months & 22 days as on 14.05.2026. It further shows that the petitioner is involved in one more case, however, he is on bail in the same. Investigation is complete.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.



CRM-M-26504-2026

-4-

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**JUDGE****15.05.2026**

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No