



CRM-M-36423-2025

216

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

CRM-M-36423-2025

Date of Decision: 06.08.2025

Manjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Arunjeet Singh Kakkar, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. A.P.S. Sidhu, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
112	26.05.2025	Sadar Faridkot, District Faridkot	118, 115(2), 351(2) and 3(5) BNS

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Per paragraph 10 of the bail petition, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the translated version of FIR, which reads as follows:

*“Statement of Hakam Singh 8/0 Chand Singh S/O Jag Singh Resident Himmatpura Basti Arniyawala Kala, District Faridkot Age About 75 years Mob: 97819-10909 Stated that I am a resident of the above address and do agricultural work. The land of Rajveer Kaur, wife of Kuldeep Singh, resident of Sirsa, is on lease with us for about 3 years. This land is situated at Kala Himmatpura Basti, village Araiya, near our house. On date 20-05-2025 the time will be 06.30 pm that I along with my son Jagjit Singh and my wife Manjeet Kaur was present at her leased land in Kole Bhupinder Singh @ Munna S/O resident of Budh Singh Araiya Wala Kala with Gandasa, Manjeet Kaur wife Baljinder Singh with Daang (stick), Naginder Kaur wile Sadhu Singh with Dang (stick), Jyoti Wife Palvinder Singh with the Baseball,*



CRM-M-36423-2025

*Gurpratap Singh Gaurav S/o Baljinder Singh Daang (stick), Palvinder Singh @ Pali S/o Sadhu Singh whether Pistol and Karnail Singh S/O Veer Singh empty handed residents of Himmatpura Basti, Aryawala arrived and when they arrived then Bhupinder Singh @Munna raised a lalkara and said that catch them and let's teach them a lesson as they being superior to us while taking the land on lease from Rajveer Kaur on which Manjeet Kaur hit me with the Daang (stick) in her hand which hit my head and then I fell down. Then Manjeet Kaur hit me with the Daang (stick) with force of her hand for the second time, which hit me on the right wrist. Bhupinder Singh Munna attacked me with Gandasa twice in a row and I raised my left hand to save myself then both the blows hit the little finger and the big finger. I shouted Marta Maria, then my son Jagilt Singh and my wife Manjit Kaur came to rescue me. Naginder Kaur, Jyoti Kaur, Curpratap Singh Gaurav came forward and attacked us with their weapons. When we screamed for protection, they all threatened to kill us. They ran away from the spot along with their weapons, then my son Jagjit Singh arranged for a ride for me. For treatment, I was admitted to Guru Gobind Singh Medical Hospital, Faridkot where I am undergoing treatment. The reason for this is that we have taken the land of Rajveer Kaur wife of Kuldeep Singh, resident of Sirsa, on lease for the last 3 years but Bhupinder Singh alias Munna also wants to take this land on lease and because of this avenge they injured me. Till now talks are going on regarding compromise, which did not work out. Bhupinder Singh Munna, Manjit Kaur, Naginder Kaur, Palvinder Singh @ Pali, Gurpratap Singh @ Gaurav, Karnail. Singh, Jyoti Kaur Uttan should be booked. I have written my statement to you, heard it and it is correct. LTI/- Hakam Singh, said statement is correct/Jagjit Singh,”*

4. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions and contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The petitioner's counsel submits that the petitioner would have no objection whatsoever to any stringent conditions that this Court may impose, including that if the petitioner repeats the offense or commits any non-bailable offense which provides for a sentence of imprisonment for more than seven years, the State may file an application to revoke this bail before the concerned Court having jurisdiction over this FIR, which shall have the authority to cancel this bail, and may do so at their discretion, to which the petitioner shall have no objection.

6. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the status report.

7. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the status report, which read as follows:

*“H. The role of the petitioner.*

*Petitioner armed with stick attacked the complainant twice, one hitting the complainant on the head and the other on the right wrist.”*



CRM-M-36423-2025

8. As per para no.12 of status report, petitioner was armed with stick and had inflicted injuries on the person of the complainant and both the injuries attributed to petitioner are blunt and falls under Section 115(2) BNS, but given the fact she is a woman and is a first offender, this Court wants to afford an opportunity to the petitioner to course correct.

9. Pre-trial incarceration should not be a replica of post-conviction sentencing. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail. An analysis of the above does not justify custodial interrogation or pre-trial incarceration.

10. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the primafacie analysis of the nature of allegations, petitioner being a woman and first offender and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

11. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail.

12. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

13. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	

14. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the



CRM-M-36423-2025

investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

15. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

16. It is clarified that if the petitioner violates any bail condition, the State and/or the victim may file an application for bail cancellation before the trial court, which shall be competent to cancel the bail or add more conditions. Furthermore, if the petitioner moves for deletion or dilution of any bail conditions, the trial court is empowered to do so.

17. **This bail is conditional, and the foundational condition is that if the petitioner indulges in any non-bailable offense, the State may file an application for cancellation of this bail before the Sessions Court, which shall have the liberty to cancel this bail.**

18. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

19. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

20. **Petition allowed** in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)  
JUDGE

06.08.2025

Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No.