



CRM-M-35503-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-35503-2026

Date of Decision: 09.07.2026

Farmeena

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Mr. Sarfraj Hussain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J.

1. Prayer in the present petition is for transfer of further investigation to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) in a case FIR No.401 dated 01.08.023 registered under Sections 148, 149, 324, 307, 302 IPC, Sections 25/54/49 of the Arms Act and Section 13(1)(A), 13(1)(B), 15(1)(B) and 16 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967, at Police Station Sadar Nuh, District Nuh.

2. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the husband of the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the Investigating Agency has not carried out the investigation in a free and fair manner and her husband has been implicated without there being no evidence against him. He has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Hasanbhai Valibhai Qureshi vs. State of Gujarat and others, 2004(2) RCR (Criminal) 463 and has submitted that further investigation of the present case be transferred to CBI.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has submitted that thorough investigation has already been carried out in the present case and sufficient material was collected by the Investigating Agency against the husband of the petitioner. He submits that challan has already been presented in the present case and the trial Court has framed the charges in this case. He further contends that bail petition filed by the husband of the



CRM-M-35503-2026

-2-

petitioner has already been declined by this Court vide order dated 17.02.2026. He has submitted that the petition filed by the petitioner is totally devoid of any merit and husband of the petitioner has every right to raise all his grievances before the trial Court at relevant time.

4. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the investigation has already been completed. Bail petition filed by the husband of the petitioner has already been declined by this Court vide order dated 17.02.2026. As submitted before this Court, learned trial Court has framed the charges on the basis of the material collected by the Investigating Agency.

5. There is no dispute regarding the law as relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioner, however, the same is distinguishable in the facts and circumstances of the present case. Therefore, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, we do not find any merit in the present case and the same is hereby dismissed. However, husband of the petitioner is at liberty to raise all his pleas as taken in this petition, before the trial Court at the appropriate stage. The trial Court would also appreciate the submission made by counsel for the applicant, if any made, in accordance with law.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

09.07.2026

sharmila

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