



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

CRM-M-19682-2025

Date of Decision:23.07.2025

Rajesh

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present: Mr.Balraj Gujjar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, Sr.DAG, Haryana.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of B.N.S.S with a prayer to grant anticipatory bail to her in case FIR No.20, dated 10.02.2025, under Sections 115,121(1),132, 221,3(5),351(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Chhainsa, Faridabad District Faridabad (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the husband of the petitioner was having a dispute with his brother and a fight had taken place between both the parties. He further contends that even the petitioner and her family members had made various representations to the police against police atrocities, however, no action was taken by the police. Learned counsel further contends that the complainant side in the present case had not received any injuries and it is a case of no injury. Still, the FIR has been got registered by the complainant side by concocting a false story. Learned counsel further contends that Ram Babu, husband of the petitioner, Harsh and Harshit, sons of the petitioner were already arrested and they are in custody. Learned counsel

further contends that the police has also in hand in gloves with the opposite party and a false FIR has been registered against the entire family. Even in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be required.

3. On the other hand learned State counsel on instructions from ACP Rajeev Kumar submits that main accused Ram Babu, husband of the petitioner, Harsh and Harshit, sons of the petitioner had already been arrested by the police and the recoveries have already been effected, however, custody of the petitioner may not be required in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, as per the admitted case of the prosecution, the recovery of incriminating evidence has already been effected and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation. Thus, no purpose will be served by sending the petitioner behind the bars.

6. Thus, without commenting any further, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is granted concession of anticipatory bail, subject to the conditions as provided under Sections 482 (2) of B.N.S.S. It will be open for the Investigating Officer to call the petitioner to join the investigation, if so required, by issuing a written notice in this regard and she shall abide by the conditions mentioned in Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S.

23.07.2025
hitesh

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No