



109+237

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16453-2024(O&M)

Date of decision:-25.03.2025

PARAMDEEP KAUR @ PARAMJIT KAUR @ RIMPI

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY.**

Present:- Mr. J.S. Ghumman, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Ankit Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Rubi, Advocate for Mr. Malkiat Singh, Advocate  
for the complainant.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SANJIV BERRY, J.(ORAL)**

**CRM-4418-2025**

1. The instant application has been preferred under Section 482 Cr.P.C for placing on record interim orders dated 12.04.2024 to 10.12.2024 passed by learned trial Court, Jalandhar as Annexure P-3.

2. The application is allowed, subject to all just exceptions, Annexure P-3 is taken on record. Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

**Main case**

1. The instant petition has been preferred by the petitioner under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, for grant of regular bail in the following case (Annexure P-1):-



FIR No.	Dated	Sections	Police Station
338	09.12.2023	302, 34 IPC and Section 25, 27 of Arms Act (120-B IPC added and 25 Arms Act deleted later on)	Rama Mandi, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar

2. Arguments heard.

3. It is *inter alia* contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is innocent and having no criminal antecedents, has been falsely implicated in this case. She is in custody since 10.12.2023 and no specific overt act is attributed to her nor she has participated in the crime as alleged. After completion of investigation, challan has already been filed in the Court and conclusion of trial will take sufficient long time as out of 29 witnesses cited by the prosecution only 1 witness has been examined till date, despite the petitioner being in custody since long. He submits that petitioner was not named in the FIR but was nominated in the supplementary statement given by the complainant attributing the the motive, which is not plausible, as according to the complainant about 13 years back there was proposal from the petitioner to marry the deceased, due to which her husband had killed the deceased by firing shot from his revolver and this version of the complainant to implicate the petitioner does not seem plausible or justifiable. He contends that the alleged occurrence took place in the washroom where the petitioner was not present, so there was no occasion for her to instigate the murder. Hence prayed for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, referring to the reply submitted by the State have opposed the bail petition by submitting that the petitioner has actively participated in the



occurrence wherein her husband has fired shot on the deceased, leading to his death. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the bail petition. However, they have admitted that out of 29 witnesses cited by the prosecution only 1 witness has been examined in the trial till date.

5. After considering the rival contentions and perusing the record, it transpires that the instant FIR was registered on the statement of the complainant Gurpreet Singh to the effect that he along with his elder brother Daljit Singh and other family members had gone to attend a party in resort where the accused Surjit Singh along with his unknown friend and his brother had also come. As per the complainant, he along with his brother Daljit had gone to the washroom where Surjit Singh was also present and Surjit Singh took out his revolver and fired at his brother. On the alarm being raised by the complainant, his relatives came to the spot and the accused Surjit Singh alongwith his brother and unknown friend fled away. Daljit Singh was taken to the hospital where he succumbed to injuries. It is further the case of the prosecution that subsequently the complainant gave supplementary statement claiming that about 13 years back the family members of petitioner Paramjit Kaur had sent a proposal for her marriage with deceased Daljit Singh which could not be finalized so out of this grudge her husband Surjit singh on her instigation had killed his brother Daljit Singh, accordingly, petitioner was arrested on 10.12.2023, after completion of investigation, challan has already been presented in Court, wherein 29 witnesses have been cited by the prosecution and till date only 1 witness has been examined.

6. It is evident from record that the petitioner was not named originally in the FIR but his name surfaced in the supplementary statement



given by the complainant claiming the motive to the fact that about 13 years back there was a proposal from the family of the petitioner for her marriage to deceased Daljit Singh which could not be finalized due to this grudge the petitioner has instigated her husband to commit murder of Daljit Singh. Admittedly the occurrence took place in the washroom where the petitioner was not present nor any injury or specific overt act is attributed to her. The petitioner is not having any criminal antecedents, and it is debatable, as to whether petitioner had actively participated in the crime in any manner or not and this aspect could be ascertained after conclusion of trial, which will take sufficient long time, as only 1 witness out of 29 witnesses cited by the prosecution has been examined so far, as such, no purpose would be served by detaining her any longer in custody.

7. In these circumstances, without commenting on the merits of the case, the present petition is allowed. The petitioner is ordered to be released on bail subject to furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of learned Trial Court concerned, if not required in any other case; undertaking to regularly appear on each and every date; not to leave the country without prior permission of the Court; and not to tamper with evidence of prosecution in any manner.

8. Any observation made above shall not be construed as opinion of this Court on the merits of the case.

9. Pending application(s) if any shall also stand disposed of.

**(SANJIV BERRY)**  
**JUDGE**

**25.03.2025**

Gyan

i) Whether speaking/reasoned?  
ii) Whether reportable?

Yes/No  
Yes/No