



CRM-M-53451-2025

1

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

Sr. No.113

CRM-M-53451-2025

Date of Decision: 26.02.2026

RAMANDEEP KAUR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present:- Mr. Raj Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Wadhwa, DAG, Punjab.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 92 dated 29.04.2023, registered under Sections 302, 201 and 34 of the IPC at Police Station Jamalpur, District Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. The present FIR No. 92 dated 29.04.2023 was registered under Sections 302, 201 and 34 IPC at Police Station Jamalpur, District Ludhiana, on the statement of complainant Surjit Kaur, wife of Satwinder Singh. As per the complainant, her husband Satwinder Singh was allegedly staying in contact with Ramandeep Kaur and was providing her with financial assistance. It is alleged that when Satwinder Singh demanded return of the money, Ramandeep Kaur along with her husband Sandeep Nagpal, her son Prince Kumar, Shivam Singh and Akash, in connivance with each other, hatched a conspiracy and murdered Satwinder Singh during the intervening



night of 28/29.04.2023. It is further alleged that after committing the murder, the accused persons threw the dead body in the fields near village Sahibana Pukhri Road, Gugga Mari, set it on fire in order to destroy evidence, and forcibly retained the white Verna car of the deceased. The complainant identified the burnt body of her husband in the Civil Hospital mortuary, leading to registration of the present case.

3. It is contended on behalf of the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in the present case and the entire prosecution story is based merely on conjectures and surmises, without any direct evidence connecting her to the alleged occurrence. It is submitted that the case rests solely on the statement of the complainant and circumstantial evidence, and even in the challan presented after investigation, no concrete or incriminating material has been found against the petitioner. The petitioner has neither caused any injury to the deceased nor was she last seen with him, and nothing has been recovered from her possession. It is further argued that the allegations have been levelled out of personal vendetta, as the complainant's husband was allegedly in an illicit relationship with the petitioner, and no prior complaint was ever made regarding the alleged threats. The petitioner has clean antecedents, is not involved in any other case, the trial is likely to take considerable time as only a few witnesses have been examined out of the total cited, and therefore no useful purpose would be served by keeping her in custody.

4. It is contended by learned State counsel that serious and grave allegations of committing the murder of deceased Satwinder Singh have been levelled against the petitioner along with her husband and other family



members. It is submitted that after registration of the FIR, investigation was conducted and during interrogation, co-accused Sandeep Nagpal (husband of the petitioner) suffered a disclosure statement wherein he disclosed that he, along with the present petitioner, their son Prince Kumar, nephew Shivam and accomplice Akash, conspired to eliminate the deceased as he was demanding return of the money earlier given by him. As per the said disclosure, on the intervening night of 28/29.04.2023, while the deceased was asleep, Akash struck him on the head with a wooden baseball bat, Shivam strangled him with a rope and the present petitioner held the legs of the deceased, thereby actively participating in the commission of the offence. It is further disclosed that after confirming his death, they tied his limbs, transported the body in a white Verna car and burnt it in the fields to destroy evidence. Various incriminating recoveries, including the vehicle, blood-stained articles and other case property, were effected pursuant to the disclosure statements. It is further argued that the petitioner is in custody for the last about two years and nine months; however, considering the heinous nature of the offence, the specific role attributed to her, and the fact that material prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined, no ground for grant of regular bail is made out.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance. The allegations levelled in the present case are of a grave and heinous nature. The prosecution case, as emerging from the FIR, the disclosure statements and the material collected during investigation, *prima facie* attributes an active and specific role to the petitioner. As per the prosecution, the deceased Satwinder Singh had been



residing with the petitioner and was bearing her household expenses, and when he started demanding return of the money earlier given, the petitioner along with her husband and other co-accused allegedly conspired to eliminate him. It is specifically alleged that on the intervening night of 28/29.04.2023, while co-accused Akash inflicted a blow on the head of the deceased with a wooden baseball bat and co-accused Shivam strangled him with a rope, the present petitioner held the legs of the deceased, thereby facilitating the commission of the murder. It is further alleged that she also participated in tying the limbs of the deceased, transporting the body in a white Verna car and burning it in the fields in an attempt to destroy evidence. Incriminating recoveries, including the vehicle and other articles, have been effected during investigation and the post-mortem report indicates multiple ante-mortem injuries sufficient to cause death in the ordinary course of nature.

6. Although the petitioner is in custody for about two years and nine months, the record reflects that the trial is still underway and material prosecution witnesses are yet to be examined. In cases involving serious offences like murder, where specific overt acts are attributed and the evidence on record *prima facie* indicates participation at every stage from conspiracy to execution and disposal of the body this Court does not find it appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on regular bail at this stage.

7. Considering the gravity of the offence, the manner in which it was allegedly committed, and the fact that key witnesses are yet to depose, this Court is of the considered opinion that no ground for grant of regular



bail is made out. Accordingly, the present regular bail application is dismissed.

8. However, anything stated hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

26.02.2026
Anu

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

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