

2026:PHHC:042205



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.57644 of 2025

Suman Rani ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana ... Respondent

|    |                                                                                                      |                |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. | The date when the judgment is reserved                                                               | 16.03.2026     |
| 2. | The date when the judgment is pronounced                                                             | 18.03.2026     |
| 3. | The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website                                                | 18.03.2026     |
| 4. | Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or whether the full judgment is pronounced | Full           |
| 5. | The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof                        | Not applicable |

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Sahil Choudhary, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,  
for the respondent-State.

\*\*\*

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under  
Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short

2026:PHHC:042205



“BNSS”) seeking regular bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

| FIR No. | Dated      | Police Station                  | Sections                    |
|---------|------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 53      | 02.03.2024 | Farakpur, District Yamuna Nagar | 302, 201, 346 and 34 of IPC |

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint filed by Sagar, grandson of victim Neelam Devi @ Poli (who was subsequently nominated as accused) on 02.03.2024 alleging that the victim had been residing alone in her house in Village Sudhal whereas his parents had been residing in a city and he himself was staying with his aunt at Village Dukhedi, District Ambala. They occasionally used to visit the house of their grandmother. He disclosed that the last conversation between them had taken place on 16.2.2024 and now they had come to know that his grandmother was missing from her house after 18.02.2024. He had visited her house with his aunt and found the house to be locked. Initially, a case under Section 346 of IPC was registered. Investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. As per the further allegations, on 07.04.2024, another complaint was filed by Vikram Singh, son-in-law of the victim Neelam Devi alleging that after coming to know about the fact that his mother-in-law had gone missing, he had made inquiries and had come to know that subsequent to lodging of FIR, Rakesh Kumar and Suman, parents of Sagar had visited the house of his mother-in-law, had broken open her room and took out some

documents. He alleged that he had made inquiries from Rakesh Kumar, his

2026:PHHC:042205



brother-in-law who had disclosed that he along with the present petitioner Suman Rani i.e. his wife and son had taken the victim to Haridwar and had strangled her to death and then had thrown her dead body in the Ganga river. On his complaint, offences under Sections 201 and 302 read with Section 34 of IPC were added. The petitioner, her husband and son were arrested on 07.04.2024. They were interrogated and suffered disclosure statement admitting their involvement in the murder of the victim and about disposing of her dead body. The dead body of the victim was recovered on 19.02.2024 from Assan Barrage area. The DNA sampling was taken and postmortem examination had also been done. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. She has clean antecedents. The allegations levelled against her are totally vague and improbable. There is no eye-witness to the occurrence. No recovery has been effected from her and a false recovery has been planted. The material witness i.e. the complainant Vikram Dev has since been examined and has not implicated her in the commission of the subject offences. The case is based on circumstantial evidence and there is no circumstance to connect her with the subject offences. The trial will take considerable time to conclude. No useful purpose would be served by detaining her in custody any more. It is, therefore, argued that she deserves to be released on bail.

2026:PHHC:042205



relying upon the status report, has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. The recovery of belongings of the victim had been effected at her instance. Her complicity in the commission of the subject offences stands established. The trial is going on at a proper pace as 05 out of 25 witnesses already stand examined. The DNA report profiling of the dead body recovered from Assan Barrage has matched with the DNA profiling of the accused Rakesh Kumar proving that the dead body was of the victim and none else. With these broad submissions, it is urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

7. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have taken the victim, who was her mother-in-law to Haridwar, on the intervening night of 17/18.02.2024 wherein all three of them are alleged to have strangled her to death and had thrown her dead body into Dalipur Canal near Vikas Nagar. The dead body was subsequently recovered from Assan Barrage area. The recovery of some incriminating articles i.e. the documents belonging to the victim has been effected at the instance of the petitioner. The allegations against her are serious in nature. The trial is going on at a proper pace and there is nothing on record to show that there would be any undue delay in conclusion of the same. Simply because of the fact that PW Vikram has turned hostile, the petitioner does not become entitled to be released on bail. Taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations levelled against the petitioner, the quantum of sentence that the

2026:PHHC:042205



conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that there is no compelling ground to allow the petition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

18.03.2026  
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |