



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

309

CRM-M-28697-2025
Decided on : 23.07.2025

Meena Bansal . . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Baljeet Beniwal, Advocate and
Ms. Ashika Kalra, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Sunny Namdev, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

Name of Petitioner(s)	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Meena Bansal	11	05.01.2025	61(2), 115(2), 117(2), 126(2), 140(3), 190, 191(2), 308(4), 309(4) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023	Palla	Faridabad

2. On the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that dispute between the parties has now been resolved with the complainant party and by noticing the said fact, husband of the petitioner, i.e., Anil, has been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 21.07.2025, passed in CRM-M-6767-2025, titled as, “Anil v. State of



Haryana". The relevant part of the said order is reproduced here-under:-

"2. On 20.02.2025, following order was passed:-

"Status report filed by way of affidavit dated 19.02.2025 of Rajesh Kumar Lohan, HPS, Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sarai, Faridabad, on behalf of respondent-State, is taken on record. Copy thereof supplied to the opposite side. Registry to do the needful.

From perusal of the affidavit, it transpires that primarily allegations have been levelled against the wife of petitioner and not against the petitioner. Posted for 08.04.2025.

In the meanwhile, petitioner shall join investigation before the Investigating Officer; but he be not arrested till the next date of hearing."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 20.02.2025, passed by this Court, the petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated.

He further submits that petitioner and his other co-accused have settled the dispute with all the members of the complainant party, thus submits that there is no requirement of custodial interrogation of the petitioner.

4. Learned State counsel submits that though he is not aware about any such compromise but does not dispute the fact of joining of investigation by the petitioner. He further submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner would not be required now for the purpose of investigation.

5. Mr. Amit Choudhary, Advocate, put in an appearance on behalf of the respondent, and files his Power of Attorney, which is taken on record, and he endorses the fact of compromise between the parties and submits that the dispute has amicably resolved.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

7. Since the petitioner has joined the investigation, custodial interrogation is no more required, present petition is allowed and ad-interim order dated 20.02.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute.

However, petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

8. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of."

3. Further, to substantiate his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the Memorandum of Understanding



(MoU)/Settlement, dated 13.05.2025 (Annexure P-3), executed between the parties at Faridabad on 13.05.2025.

The factum of execution of such compromise/settlement has even been endorsed by learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2, who also submits that dispute amongst the parties has been entirely resolved.

4. Factors, which are being noticed by this Court are that husband of the petitioner 'Anil', has already been released on bail and primary dispute between the parties has been resolved amicably, and also the fact that petitioner is inside jail since 14th April, 2025, i.e., for a period of about 03 months and 08 days. Further that, after completion of investigation, challan has been submitted and even charges have also been framed. However, the process of recording of statements of the prosecution witnesses is yet to start and therefore, culmination of trial shall is likely to take considerable time.

5. After considering the totality of circumstances, and the nature of allegations leveled against the petitioner, and the factors noticed here-above, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioner.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. Needless to observe that the petitioner shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

8. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as



an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

July 23, 2025
J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No