



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

**CRM-M-22306-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 23.04.2026**

ISHNEET KAUR

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present: Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J (ORAL)

1. This is the first petition under Section 482 BNSS (erstwhile Section 438 Cr.P.C.) for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 14 dated 08.01.2026, under Section 108 BNS, 2023 (erstwhile Section 306 IPC), registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala, District Patiala.

2. It has been averred in the petition that the petitioner, a young woman aged about 23 years was employed as a Junior SEO Executive in June 2025 in a company namely Richestsoft, Industrial Area, Mohali, where the deceased Sahil was also working as her immediate supervisor. The deceased allegedly developed personal interest in the petitioner and started pressurizing her to enter into a relationship, which she refused. It is alleged that the deceased thereafter started harassing the petitioner by making



repeated calls and messages and even fabricated a marriage card in their names. The petitioner had earlier lodged a complaint against the deceased, which was later withdrawn due to fear of further harassment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and no offence under Section 108 BNSS (erstwhile Section 306 IPC) is made out against her. It is argued that the petitioner was, in fact, a victim of continuous harassment at the hands of the deceased, who was her immediate supervisor at the workplace. The deceased had developed an obsessive and possessive attitude towards the petitioner and started pressurizing her to enter into a relationship, which she refused, and thereafter subjected her to repeated calls, messages and mental harassment.

4. It is further contended that due to the conduct of the deceased, the petitioner was compelled to leave her job within a short span of joining. The deceased even fabricated a marriage certificate/card in order to malign and pressurize the petitioner. The petitioner had also approached the Women Helpline, Mohali, and lodged a complaint regarding the mental harassment and misuse of her photographs/videos, which substantiates her version. Learned counsel further submits that the FIR in question was initially registered against an unknown person, and there is no direct or proximate evidence to show that the petitioner ever instigated, abetted or provoked the deceased to commit suicide. The allegations are vague and based on hearsay, as even the complainant has only stated that he came to know from friends that the deceased was being harassed by a girl.

5. It is also argued that the alleged suicide note, wherein the petitioner has been named, does not disclose any specific act of instigation



or abetment attributable to the petitioner. The essential ingredients of the offence under Section 306 IPC are, therefore, not satisfied. Lastly, it is contended that the petitioner had earlier approached the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Patiala, for grant of anticipatory bail, however, the same was wrongly dismissed without properly appreciating the material on record. Reliance has also been placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '*Prabhu vs. State and another*', 2024 SCC OnLine SC 137, to argue that in cases of failed relationships, in the absence of any direct act of instigation, the offence of abetment of suicide is not made out. Hence, the petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail.

6. Notice of motion.

7. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate, has also put in appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed his *Vakalatnama*, which is taken on record. Learned State counsel, assisted by counsel for the complainant, has opposed the present petition on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner. It is submitted that the deceased has left behind a detailed suicide note running into seven pages and had also uploaded a video prior to committing suicide, wherein grave and specific allegations have been made against the petitioner. It is contended that this is not a simple case of a broken relationship, rather the petitioner had been continuously harassing the deceased, which ultimately led him to take the extreme step. The suicide note and video clearly show instigating and abetting the commission of suicide by the petitioner.



8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

9. At this stage, it cannot be said that the case in hand is merely one of a failed or broken relationship simpliciter. The judgment i.e. *Prabhu's case (supra)* relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioner is distinguishable on facts. In the present case, there is a detailed suicide note of seven pages wherein the deceased has levelled specific and categorical allegations against the petitioner, stating that she had been harassing him and that he was taking the extreme step on account of the conduct attributable to her. Apart from the suicide note, there is also a video recorded by the deceased prior to his death, wherein similar allegations have been reiterated.

10. The material collected during investigation, at this stage, *prima facie* indicates that the role attributed to the petitioner cannot be brushed aside as vague or general in nature. The allegations are specific and require thorough investigation. The existence of a detailed suicide note coupled with a video recording *prima facie* reflecting the mental state of the deceased and attributing responsibility to the petitioner, distinguishes the present case from those where no proximate or direct instigation is made out.

11. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, as well as the material available on record, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

12. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

13. However, it is made clear that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.



14. All pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

23.04.2026

Poonam Negi

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No