



CRM-M-70491-2025 (O&M)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-70491-2025 (O&M)
Reserved on: 10.02.2026
Pronounced on: 12.02.2026
Uploaded on: 12.02.2026

HARNOOR SINGH

PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Argued by: Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG Punjab.

Shalini Singh Nagpal, J.

1. Petitioner seeks regular bail in FIR No.74 dated 09.06.2025 under Sections 108 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023, Police Station Kotbhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib. This is the first petition for regular bail.
2. Complainant stated that for the last one year his daughter Harpreet Kaur aged 19 years was enrolled in a computer course. Harnoor Singh, son of Gurpiar Singh, resident of Village Dhulkot, Sri Muktsar Sahib was also doing the course. The spoke to each other occasionally, in connection with matters relating to the computer course. Harnoor Singh pressurized Harpreet Kaur to meet him frequently upon which his daughter informed him that he was harassing her without any reason. He went to the house of Harnoor Singh and complained to his mother, yet Harnoor Singh did not stop talking to his daughter who became mentally disturbed. Harpreet Kaur told him that Harnoor Singh was in possession of her videos, which he had threatened to upload on social media and insisted that she marry him but she refused saying that she could not marry without the consent of her family. On 28.05.2025,



CRM-M-70491-2025 (O&M)

his daughter left home to attend computer course but did not return. He lodged a missing report in Police Station, Kotbhai and continued searching her. On 08.06.2025, dead body of Harpreet Kaur was recovered from a canal. On 09.06.2025, on statement of his son Jashan Singh, proceedings were done. He believed that Harnoor Singh and his mother Mandeep Kaur pressurized his daughter Harpreet Kaur by threatening to upload her videos on social media and forced her to marry Harnoor Singh. Due to harassment by Harnoor Singh and Mandeep Kaur, Harpreet Kaur committed suicide by jumping into the canal. Legal action was prayed for.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that petitioner was behind bars with effect from 10.06.2025. He was innocent and had been falsely implicated in the FIR. There was no suicide note left behind by the deceased. Both petitioner and the deceased were in a relationship and even if the allegations in the FIR were accepted at their face value, no offence of abetment of suicide was made out against the petitioner as there was neither any instigation on his part nor any *mens rea* to commit the offence. Therefore, he deserved to be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer for regular bail arguing that deceased committed suicide on account of the harassment by the petitioner who threatened to upload her obscene videos on social media and to marry her. Considering the serious nature of allegations, petitioner did not deserve the concession of bail. She further submitted that one witness was examined out of 21 and the trial was in progress. Custody certificate was placed on record.

5. As per custody certificate, petitioner is in custody for the last 07 months and 27 days and Trial is in progress. Admittedly, deceased was friends with Harnoor Singh. On a specific query put by the Court, learned State



CRM-M-70491-2025 (O&M)

counsel informed that no obscene videos were recovered from the mobile phone of the petitioner taken into possession during investigation. She submits that the videos found in the mobile phone were not obscene and were couple videos. In the facts and circumstances of the case, whether or not the petitioner abetted the commission of suicide by Harpreet Kaur would be moot point during the trial, which would take some time to conclude; considering that only one witness has been partly recorded out of 21. Antecedents of the petitioner are clean. He is not stated to be involved in any other case. There is no reason to suspect that he would obstruct the trial. Hence, the petition for regular bail is allowed. Petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to his furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to the satisfaction of Trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

6. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

12.02.2026
HS.CHAUHAN

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No