

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

2025.PHHC.104082



(218)

**CRM-M-31888-2025
Decided on : 12.08.2025**

Jaida

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate, for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Anmol Partap Singh Mann, Advocate &
Mr. Navjot Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the complainant.

Sumeet Goel (Oral):

1. Apprehending her arrest in FIR No.41 dated 08.03.2023 registered for offences punishable under Sections 409, 420 IPC at Police Station Nagina, District Mewat; the petitioner has preferred this petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeking pre-arrest bail.

2. Vide order dated 09.06.2025, the interim protection was afforded to the petitioner. Reiterating the case of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail, learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner's tenure as Sarpanch has expired in the year 2021 and the complaint was made against him in the year 2023, which led to the registration of the FIR in hand in the year 2024. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further argued that the petitioner has already joined

investigation in terms of interim protection afforded to her vide order dated 09.06.2025 and has cooperated therein. On the strength of these submissions, grant of anticipatory bail is entreated for.

3. Learned State counsel (on instructions from ASI Dharminder) has submitted that the petitioner has joined investigation but there is likelihood that she may abscond, and thus, she may not be afforded the concession of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that allegations raised against the petitioner are serious in nature and in case the petitioner is afforded the protection of interim anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that she may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the witnesses. Learned counsel for the complainant has further argued that the concerned record of the Gram Panchayat is yet to be handed over to the Gram Panchayat, which is causing difficulty in smooth functioning of the Gram Panchayat.

5. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand, especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated therein and her custodial interrogation is only required for recovery of some documents, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 09.06.2025 granting interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be

confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

August 12, 2025

Naveen

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No