



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

125

CRM-M-70339-2025
Decided on : 07.04.2026

Jyoti . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Kompal Arora, Advocate for
Mr. Ravi Kamal Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. P.K. Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Jyoti	271	31.07.2024	103(1) of BNS, 2023	Ambala City	Ambala

2. There are two deceased female children in present case, namely Yogita (aged 11 years) and Amira (aged 7 years). Petitioner herein is mother of both deceased children.

FIR in present case was registered on statement of father-in-law of petitioner, who in his statement got recorded suspicion against one Vikas @ Kachcha. However, during investigation, no fault of named accused in FIR was found, rather, it was petitioner, who was found involved in crime.



3. Version of complainant, as mentioned in paragraph No.6 of impugned order dated 15.09.2025, declining bail to petitioner, reads as under:-

“6. This case has been registered on the statement of complainant Ved Parkash alleging therein that his adopted son Sonu was married with applicant/accused Jyoti and out of this wedlock, three children namely son Saurabh and two daughters Yogita and Amayra were born. That his son Sonu was a drug addict since last about four years. As per the complainant on 31.07.2024 at about 7.00 a.m. one person namely Vikas @ Kacha Ram had come to his house who had blamed his son Soun for committing theft of money on which an altercation took place between them. That after being pacified by the neighbours, the said person Vikas had left his house. Thereafter a verbal spat took place between him and his son Sonu after which he had kept the mobile phone of Sonu with him. At about 8.00 a.m. the complainant alongwith his grandson Saurabh had left the house for his work and his son Sonu had also left the house after carrying his clothes in bag. As per the complainant his daughter in law Jyoti (applicant/accused) who is working as maid had also left the house for her job whereas due to the holiday, both his grand daughters were at home. At about 9.00 a.m. he had asked his grandson Saurabh to bring the mobile phone of his son Sonu from the house and when Saurabh had reached the house, he had found both the minor daughters lying unconscious near stairs in the house. That when Saurabh had raised the alarm, neighbours had gathered there and after getting information, he had also reached the house and found that his both grand daughters Amayra and Yogita had been murdered after inflicting injuries on their necks. The complainant suspected that this offence has committed by accused Vikas @ Kacha who was bearing a grudge against his son Sonu. He had thus prayed for taking a legal action against the accused Vikas @ Kacha.

During investigation, the involvement of the applicant/accused Jyoti was found in crime and she was arrested on 05.08.2025 and in pursuance to her disclosure statement, the chunni used in the offence was recovered. However, the involvement of the alleged co- accused Vikas @ Kacha was not found in the offence.”

4. It is argued by learned counsel for petitioner that neither there is



any motive attributed to petitioner as to why she would kill her own daughters, nor complainant – Ved Parkash (father-in-law of petitioner), while appearing before trial Court as PW-1, has supported the case of prosecution.

Learned counsel further argues that it is investigating officer, who substituted the suspect with petitioner, without there being any evidence against her. Moreover, case of prosecution completely depends upon circumstantial evidence.

On the basis of aforementioned submissions and factual aspects of case, learned counsel for petitioner prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. On other hand, learned State counsel, while referring to paragraph No.6 of status report, submits that as per CCTV footage, petitioner left house on 31.07.2024 at about 8:53 AM, whereas, she usually leaves for work around 6:45 AM to 7:15 AM.

Further reliance is placed upon disclosure statement and recovery of chunni, at the instance of the petitioner.

Further points out that incident in question took place in morning of 31.07.2024, and injury marks were noticed on 03.08.2024 on thumb near right hand and also on her right arm and left wrist, when petitioner and her husband Sonu were called at Police Station.

6. Faced with situation, learned counsel for petitioner submits that even if it is assumed that scratch marks were present on thumb/wrist of petitioner, at this stage, it cannot be assumed that said injuries were suffered by petitioner, while committing alleged offence, as deceased might have resisted. For the said purpose, there has to be some comparative analysis by



the experts.

7. I have heard learned counsel for parties and gone through record with their able assistance.

8. Undoubtedly, gruesome murder has been committed. However, whether said act has been committed by petitioner or someone else, would be subject matter of trial. More or less, case of prosecution is based upon circumstantial and documentary evidence. Rather, complainant – Ved Parkash, who is father-in-law of petitioner, before whom petitioner allegedly confessed her guilt, has not even supported the case of prosecution while appearing in witness-box.

9. Besides, considering that petitioner is a woman, reference may also be made to Section 480(1) of BNSS, 2023, which reflects legislative intent that a person who is a child, woman, sick or infirm should not ordinarily be kept inside jail for an indefinite & long period.

10. In the totality of circumstances, it appears that until charges are duly proved, petitioner need not to be kept inside the jail for an indefinite period. Therefore, this Court is of considered view that liberty of petitioner be also not curtailed in the absence of any incriminating evidence.. Thus, without commenting upon merits of case, this Court deems it appropriate to extend concession of regular bail to petitioner.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.



11. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

12. The observation made here-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

13. Petition stands **disposed of**.

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 07, 2026

J.Ram

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