



CRM-M-69046 of 2025

-1-

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

211

CRM-M-69046 of 2025
Date of Decision: 02.02.2026

Manjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Ms. Sushma Chopra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. B.D. Sharma, Advocate for the complainant.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.56 dated 09.06.2025 registered under Sections 103(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, at Police Station Bhindi Saidan, District Amritsar.

2. Brief facts of the present case are that the petitioner along with other co-accused, brutally attacked and caused injuries to Sarabjit Singh (son of the complainant), due to which he died.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She argued that in fact, the dispute in the present case relates to property and the present FIR is counterblast to FIR No.13 dated 07.03.2023, which was registered by the

**CRM-M-69046 of 2025****-2-**

petitioner against the complainant wherein the complainant party caused injuries on the person of minor son of the petitioner-Lovepreet Singh and the same is also pending adjudication. She further argued that there is no eye-witness of the alleged occurrence. She argued that the deceased had died due to electric shock at the place of occurrence. She further argued that even if the prosecution story is believed to be true, then also no specific role has been attributed to the petitioner. Moreover, the petitioner has clean antecedents as she is not involved in any other case and no recovery is to be effected from her. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when called upon to do so by the investigating agency.

4. After registration of the FIR, investigation has been initiated and is under way. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Amritsar, vide order dated 18.09.2025.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while referring to the status report, has opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail, by submitting that the allegations levelled against the petitioner are serious in nature. He argued that the petitioner was specifically named in the FIR. He further argued that the petitioner along with other co-accused had murdered the deceased by causing injuries on his head and thereafter, they gave electric shock to the deceased, because of some land dispute. He further argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required as weapon used in the crime is yet to be recovered and also to unearth the modus



CRM-M-69046 of 2025

-3-

operandi. Hence, he prays for dismissal of the petition.

6. Learned counsel for the complainant adopts the submissions of learned State counsel and while opposing the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, has contended that the petitioner has played an active role in the crime and, thus, does not deserve the concession of bail.

7. Heard.

8. In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and she is specifically named in the FIR. As per the status report filed by the State, the petitioner along with other co-accused had murdered the deceased by causing injuries on his head and thereafter, gave electric shock to him. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required to unearth the *modus operandi* and to complete the investigation, which so far indicates involvement of the petitioner in the alleged crime.

9. It is befitting to mention here that while considering a plea for grant of anticipatory bail, the Court has to equilibrate between safeguarding individual rights and protecting societal interest(s). The Court ought to reckon with the magnitude and nature of the offence; the role attributed to the accused; the need for fair and free investigation as also the deeper and wide impact of such alleged iniquities on the society. It would be apposite to refer herein judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**State Vs. Anil Sharma**', (1997) 7 SCC 187, wherein it has been held as under:

"6. We find, force in the submission of CBI that custodial interrogation is qualitatively more elicitation-oriented than questioning a suspect who is well-ensconced with a favourable order under Section 438 of the Code. In a case like this, effective interrogation of a suspected person is of tremendous advantage in



CRM-M-69046 of 2025

-4-

disinterring many useful information and also materials which would have been concealed. Success in such interrogation would elude if the suspected person knows that he is well protected and insulated by a pre-arrest bail order during the time he is interrogated. Very often interrogation in such a condition would reduce to a mere ritual. The argument that the custodial interrogation is fraught with the danger of the person being subjected to third degree methods need not be countenanced, for, such an argument can be advanced by all accused in all criminal cases. The Court has to presume that responsible police officers would conduct themselves in a responsible manner and that those entrusted with the task of disinterring offences would not conduct themselves as offenders."

10. Accordingly, this Court finds no merit in the present petition in the factual matrix of the case in hand. Moreover, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for effective investigation and if it is denied, it will leave many loose ends, which is not desired. Thus, the present petition being devoid of merits is hereby dismissed.

11. It is made clear that nothing said hereinabove shall be deemed to be an expression of opinion upon merits of the case.

02.02.2026*D.Bansal*

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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