



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

323

CRM-M-63741 of 2024
Date of decision: 02.02.2026

Ranjit Kaur

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE AARADHNA SAWHNEY

Present: Mr. M.S. Dua, Advocate and
Mr. Himanshu Joshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Thapar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nitin Sachdeva, Advocate for the complainant.

AARADHNA SAWHNEY, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS is for grant of regular bail in case FIR No.103 dated 05.05.2024 under Sections 302,34 IPC (Sections 109 and 120-B IPC were added later on) registered at P.S Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur.

Relevant facts as emerging from the documents on record be noticed hereinbelow:

Paramjit Singh, son of Virsa Singh, resident of Uchmood Mohalla Lahoria, PS Tada, District Hoshiarpur, an agriculturist by profession set criminal law in motion by filing a complaint pointing therein that at about 10.00/10.15, when he was at home, he received a call from Gurdev Singh, son of Ajit Sigh. Since Paramjit Singh was busy in attending to another call, he could not take the call. At about 10.23 AM, he called up Gurdev Singh who disclosed that Jodh



Singh, son of Achar Singh had been injured by some unknown persons in the forest area and asked him (Paramjit) to reach at the site. While he was on his way, he (Parmjit) received yet another call from Gurdev Singh who informed that someone had killed Jodh Singh by inflicting multiple injuries. When he (complainant) reached at the site, he saw his uncle Jodh Singh lying dead on a secluded road leading to the Forest area. He also noticed deep wounds caused by sharp weapons on the body of his uncle, whose left wrist had been cut from blunt and sharp aged weapons. Such like marks were also noticed on the neck of late Jodh Singh. On the basis of said complaint, complainant requested the police officials to catch hold of all those, who were responsible in the gruesome killing of Jodh Singh and also to initiate appropriate proceedings against them. On the basis of said complaint, aforesaid FIR was registered. During the course of investigation, I.O visited the site, prepared rough site plan. Incharge of FSL also visited the site, collected the samples of soil with blood-stains near body of Jodh Singh and put it in the plastic bag, which was later converted into a sealed parcel. Cheery colored Scooter bearing No.PB-21-F-6776 (Make Jupiter) was also recovered from the spot. Inquest proceedings were conducted.

It is further the case of prosecution that during the investigation, Gurdev Singh who had intimated about the death of Jodh Singh through Paramjit Singh, appeared before the I.O and got his statement recorded pointing therein that in his presence, Granthi of their village namely Gurpal Singh and his nephew Himmat singh admitted having killed Jodh Singh, the President of the Gurudwara. Both Gurpal Singh and Himmat Singh were produced in the police station along with Car No.PB-07-BV-6374. Accordingly, above mentioned two were nominated as accused and were arrested on 06.05.2024. During further course of investigation, Gurpal Singh (A) confessed to his involvement in the commission of



offence and disclosed that he was nursing a grudge against late Jodh Singh, who was President of the Gurudwara as he (A) apprehended that Jodh Singh can remove him from the post of Granthi. He (A) along with his nephew Himmat Singh (A2) noticed Jodh Singh in a secluded area in the morning of 05.05.,2024 and after ensuring that no one was present near the vicinity, both of them mercilessly assaulted Jodh Singh with kirpan and gave multiple injuries to him. As a result thereof, Jodh Singh died at the spot. Both he (Gurpal Singh) and Himmat Singh fled from the spot in their car. It is further the case of prosecution that weapon of offence was recovered at the instance of Gurpal Singh and Himmat Singh.

It is also the case of prosecution that during the course of further investigation, co-accused Gurpal Singh came out with a fresh disclosure statement pointing therein that being 'granthi' at the village Gurudwara, he used to frequently visit the house of late Jodh singh, who was the President of the said Gurudwara. He had developed friendly relations with Ranjit Kaur (petitioner), sister-in-law of late Jodh singh. The lady often used to share her pain and suffering with him and had disclosed that Jodh Singh (since deceased) was very cunning and miser person. On account of ill-health of her husband, Jodh Singh had taken possession of the land and also used to illegally collect the money that was sent by her children who had settled abroad. She was dependent on him on each and every small requirement and had become fed up of him. In fact, Ranjit Kaur (petitioner) had requested him (Gurpal Singh) that in case Jodh Singh is done to death, she would have control over the entire landed property and in lieu of this task, his (Gurpal's) children would be sent to English Medium School. A sum of Rs. 2 lacs in cash was also offered to him for this illegal act. Somehow, he got taken in these talks of Ranjit Kaur and decided to go ahead with the offer. He



also shared details of his nephew Himmat Singh who also agreed to help him in eliminating Jodh Singh. On the basis of said disclosure statement, Ranjit Kaur was nominated as accused and offence under Section 120-B IPC was added. She was arrested on 08.05.2024. During the course of investigation, she also confessed to her involvement & threw light on the reasons/motive prompting her to get her brother-in-law eliminated. In this context, she shared her plan with Guralpal Singh, who was on friendly terms with her. She further confessed to have given Rs.50,000/- to Guralpal Singh.

It also came to the notice of police Authorities that from the money received from the present petitioner namely (Ranjit Kaur), co-accused Guralpal Singh had purchased a vehicle i.e Verna car bearing Registration No.PB-07-BV-6374 from one Vinay for Rs.1,80,000/-. Some money had been transferred from account of brother of petitioner. Section 109 IPC was added vide DDR No.21 dated 27.07.2024. Admittedly, investigations in the present case are complete, for, challan has been filed.

Petitioner, who was arrested on 08.05.2024, filed an application for grant of bail. Same was dismissed by learned Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur vide order dated 29.11.2024. Aggrieved of which the present petition has been filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner was neither named in the FIR nor in the first disclosure statement of co-accused Himmat Singh, thus his false implication is evident. Initially, Guralpal Singh and Himmat Singh were arrayed as accused on the basis of an 'extra judicial confession' allegedly made by both of them before one Gurdev Singh. During the course of investigation, co-accused Guralpal Singh in his first disclosure statement given to the police Authorities elaborated upon the strained relations between him and late Jodh Singh who often used to scold him. That apart, co-accused Guralpal



Singh came up with the version that he was under the impression that being the President of the Local Gurudwara Sahib, deceased wielded lot of influence over the Managing Committee and could get him (Gurpal Singh) removed from the post of 'Granthi' and, thus, he along with his nephew Himmat Singh killed him. On similar lines is the disclosure statement of co-accused namely, Himmat Singh. The weapon used by them in the commission of offence was also recovered and was sent to the FSL. However, twisting the entire genesis of the occurrence, co-accused Gurpal Singh suffered another disclosure statement whereby he attributed motive to the present petitioner, who according to him had incited him to kill Jodh Singh. Learned counsel contends that the police Authorities who were hand in gloves with co-accused Gurpal Singh are trying to shield him and with this aim in view, they introduced new fact of petitioner nursing grudge against her own brother-in-law.

It is further the submission of learned counsel that in fact, complainant-Paramjit Singh, who was business partner of the deceased, is also a person of questionable antecedents. Several complaints are pending against him. Only with a view to grab the family assets of late Jodh Singh, this new twist was given to the story whereby present petitioner was introduced in the second disclosure statement of co-accused Gurpal Singh and Himmat Singh. The story put-forth by above named two accused that the present petitioner was unhappy with the deceased who is her real brother-in-law as he used to ridicule her on any given opportunity and had complete control over the finances in the family, is absolutely incorrect, for, both the children of the petitioner, who are well settled, are residing abroad. She was not financially dependent on him for her day to day needs. Thus, there was no question of her nursing any ill-will against her brother-in-law. In fact, deceased was unmarried and was an emotional anchor of the entire



family. He used to take care of her (petitioner's) ailing husband. Thus, the crux of submission raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that in view of multiple disclosure statements suffered by co-accused Gurpal Singh whereby entire genesis of the incident has been changed, false motive has been attributed to the petitioner, her false implication is crystal clear. In the light of factual scenario of the case in hand, further as per learned counsel, the petitioner, who has been in custody since 08.05.2024 deserves to be extended benefit of bail, for her further incarceration would not serve any useful purpose, moreso when chances of completion of trial in the near future are quite remote as out of 31 prosecution witnesses, only 08 have been examined.

Per contra, learned State counsel as also counsel for the complainant have vehemently opposed the request for grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner is a kingpin of the entire incident. It was at her instance that co-accused Gurpal Singh, who was the 'Granthi' of the same Gurudwara Sahib of which deceased was the President agreed to kill Jodh Singh. Plea taken by the petitioner that since her name did not figure in the FIR or in the first disclosure statement of co-accused Gurpal Singh and Himmat Singh, proves her innocence, deserves not to be taken note of. It was only after persistent questioning that co-accused Gurpal Singh came out with a real picture. According to him, relations between the petitioner and her late brother-in-law Jodh Singh were far from cordial. Husband of the petitioner was unwell. Late Jodh Singh was the only bread earner of the family. He had complete control over the finances of the family and whenever petitioner used to ask for money from him, he used to ridicule her. She was fed up of the insults which were heaped on her by him (late Jodh Sigh) and poured out her feelings to co-accused Gurpal Singh, who assured that after the death of Jodh Singh, she would take control over all the assets of the family and



would incur education expenses of his children in a English Medium School apart from promising him Rs.2 lacs, in lieu thereof. In fact, Rs.50,000/- was also transferred to account of one of accused. Police Authorities found out that co-accused Gurpal Singh had purchased a Verna Car from one Vinay, in whose account, some money had been transferred by the daughter of petitioner. It further emerges from the documents on record that the complainant also got recorded a supplementary statement pointing out therein that inquiries at his own level revealed that relationship between the petitioner and her brother-in-law Jodh Singh were far from cordial.

It is, thus the submission of learned State counsel that in the light of role played by the petitioner, long custody by itself cannot itself be a ground to extend the concession of bail to the petitioner.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

In view of submissions advanced by learned State counsel, accompanied by learned counsel for the complainant, but without advertng to the merits of the case, lest it may prejudice the trial, as also keeping in mind nature and gravity of offence, this Court does not find it a fit case for grant of bail, particularly when the material witnesses are yet to testify and there exists a risk of tampering with evidence. Moreover, the veracity and weightage required to be attached to the disclosure statement made by the co-accused will be fully tested at the time of trial.

Finding no merit in the petition, the same is dismissed.

02.02.2026
manoj

(AARADHNA SAWHNEY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No