

110

2026.PHHC.086650



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32833-2026  
Decided On: 04.06.2026

VIJAY KUMAR @ SABU PANDIT

....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

....RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

**Present:** Mr. Munish Puri, Advocate for the petitioner

**SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J. (ORAL)**

**1. Prayer**

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in FIR No.64 dated 11.05.2026 under Section 108 and 351 (3) (Previously Section 306, 506 IPC) registered at Police Station Taragarh, District Pathankot.

**2. Contention**

**On behalf of the petitioner**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case, as the prosecution story is based on bald and absurd allegations raised by the complainant regarding the unfortunate death of his son. It is further contended that there are no direct or proximate allegations indicating any intentional instigation or active assistance on the part of the accused to compel the deceased to commit suicide, nor is there any evidence linking the petitioner with the unfortunate death of Ramesh Pal. It is

also submitted that there is no suicide note or any other document, statement, or material against the present petitioner, and he has been implicated merely on account of being the father of co-accused Shiva. The petitioner further submits that he is ready and willing to join the investigation.

Notice of motion.

### **On behalf of the State**

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Verma, Addl. AG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent–State and vehemently opposes the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner while relying upon the prosecution version in the FIR and police record.

### **3. Analysis**

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, it is evident that, according to the prosecution case based on the statement of Shakuntala Devi, she had four sons and three daughters, and his elder son, Ramesh Pal, was working as a confectioner. It is alleged that his wife, namely Jaswanti @ Lalita, was in an illicit relationship with one Shiva. The said fact regarding the alleged illicit relationship came to light on 16.02.2026, whereas the body of deceased Ramesh Pal was found on 10.05.2026, he having gone missing since 06.05.2026.

There is a gap of almost three months between the alleged discovery of the illicit relationship and the death of the deceased, which provides sufficient and reasonable time for a person to recover from the initial shock arising out of such information.

Thereafter, the FIR was registered on 11.05.2026 under Sections 108 and 315(3) of the BNS, based on the statement of Shakuntala Devi.

The essential ingredients of close proximity between the alleged act and the suicide, as well as any intentional instigation or active participation by the accused leading to such circumstances, are *prima facie* found to be missing.

The petitioner has further undertaken in para 11 of the present petition that he is ready and willing to join the investigation and shall fully cooperate in its furtherance. Therefore, this Court finds no reason to decline the present petition.

#### 4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to his joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

*‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-*

*(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*

*(ii) a condition that the person shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*

*(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;*

*(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.’*

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

Pending application(s), if any shall disposed off, accordingly.

**(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)**  
**JUDGE**

**04.06.2026**

*NainaRajput*

*Whether speaking/reasoned*

*:Yes/No*

*Whether reportable*

*:Yes/No*