



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

**CRM-M-28292-2026
Date of Decision:26.05.2026**

Rekha Devi @ Rekha Rani

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and Anr.

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr. Jatinder Nagpal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Charanpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant regular bail to her in case FIR No. 141, dated 12.10.2023, registered under Sections 302,201,120-B of IPC{corresponding to Sections 103/238/61 of B.N.S} Police Station Kotwali Nabha Patiala (Annexure P-1).

2. The F.I.R in the present case was registered on the basis of statement made by Surjeet Singh. He alleged that his sister Paramjit Kaur was married to Nimma Ram son of Jagga Ram on 09.11.2021. After sometime, Nimma Ram, his father Jagga Ram, mother-in-law Rekha Devi and sisters-in-law namely Anju and Sapna started harassing his sister Paramjit Kaur and were demanding dowry. Due to this harassment on account of demand of dowry and threats, Paramjit Kaur had allegedly died and her in-laws family had taken his sister to cremation ground for cremation. He along with his friends reached the cremation ground and stopped the cremation. In the meantime, the fire brigade



reached at the spot and with the help of fire brigade, they had put off the fire and the dead body of his sister was taken out. She was killed by her husband Nimma Ram and others on the night intervening 11/12-10-2023 and without informing them, they wanted to cremate the dead body of his sister in order to destroy the evidence. With these broad allegations, the F.I.R in the present case was registered against the petitioner and other family members.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is the step mother-in-law of Paramjit Kaur, since deceased and she had no relation with the matrimonial discord between the deceased and her husband namely Nimma Ram. The petitioner along with her daughters was residing separately on the ground floor of the house with an independent kitchen, whereas, the deceased and her husband were residing separately on the first floor. Even otherwise, the petitioner is daily wage labourer working in the grain market and ordinarily remained away from home from 08:00 AM to 06:00 PM on account of her job. Consequently, the petitioner has been wrongly projected as a member of the alleged unlawful assembly, which was present at the time of place of occurrence. Learned counsel further submits that even from the FIR, it is apparent that no specific role or any other overt act has been attributed to the petitioner. Even, the complainant has levelled general and omnibus allegations against the present petitioner and she could never be the beneficiary of any demand of dowry from the deceased or her family members. Still further, the petitioner was arrested in the present case on 14.11.2023 and is in custody since then. Even, the petitioner is a first offender and was never involved in any other crime. The prosecution has relied upon 29 witnesses and only 02 witnesses have



been examined so far.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that serious and specific allegations have been levelled against the present petitioner and he does not deserve the concession of bail by this Court.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is the step mother-in-law of the deceased and is in custody for the last more than two years and six months. Still further, the prosecution has been able to examine only two witnesses so far and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

7. Without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to her furnishing bail bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/ Duty Magistrate/Chief Judicial Magistrate.

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

26.05.2026
hitesh

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No