



219

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-37668-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 18.08.2025

GEETA RANI

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Mayur Karkra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Pooja Nayar Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mayur Singh, Advocate for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (ORAL)

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
126	07.06.2025	City Rajpur, District Patiala	333/115(2)/126(2)/351(2)/ 190/191(3) of BNS, 2023 (Section 117(2) of BNS, 2023 added later on)

1. The petitioner apprehending arrest in the FIR captioned above has come up before this Court under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, [BNSS], seeking anticipatory bail.
2. Per paragraph 22 of the bail petition and para 17 of the short reply, the petitioner has no criminal antecedents.
3. The facts and allegations are being taken from the reply filed by the State, which reads as follows:

“That the present case/FIR No. 126 (supra) was registered pursuant to the statement dated 07.06.2025 of Charanjit Singh (complainant) to the effect that on 06.06.2025 at around 06:05 PM, he returned home from market on his Aactiva and thereafter, parked his Aactiva near the wall of the park and entered in his house to close the gate. When he looked towards the street, he saw that Subhash Chawla, his Meena Chawla and son Tarun Chawla were standing in front of his house in the street. Tarun Chawla made obscene gesture with his arm and when complainant asked him for the reason for the gesture, he got furious and picked up a brick from the street and threw it at the complainant. However, the brick missed him and thereafter, all the three Tarun Chawla, Meena Chawla and Subhash Chawla started abusing him and extending him life threats. They entered in the house of complainant and attacked him with bricks and stones. The complainant got



unconscious and fell on the ground but even then, they continued slapping and giving fist blows. Tarun Chawla gave a fist blow on the face and eye of complainant and also grabbed his neck to strangle him. Meena Chawla and Subhash Chawla also gave him slap blows and fist blows. At the time of the said assault, complainant was alone at his house. When he started screaming, an elderly woman passing by tried to intervene but they did not stop. There was a girl named Sweetie at the house, who was kept by complainant for taking care of his mother, who also raised alarm, due to which, the said persons fled away from the spot. When they fled, Amrik Singh, Sadha Singh and Karnail Singh, who were walking in the park, also saw the said Subhash Chawla, Meena Chawla and Tarun Chawla coming out of the house of complainant. Later on, complainant's wife Manjeet Kaur, who had gone to Gurudwara Sahib, came and admitted him to AP Jain Hospital, Rajpura. The reason of enmity was that the said persons had attacked him previously also in the year 2008. That time, Subhash Chawla and Tarun Chawla had apologized and entered into a compromise. Due to the prior grudge, the said persons assaulted the complainant again. The complainant further stated that 07.06.2025, when his wife was standing near the gate of the park, Prakash, brother-in-law of Subhash Chawla, passed comment while passing from there that thank God complainant was saved and they would see him other time. Moreover, one Ranveer and both the sons of Prakash and Tarun Chawla's wife pass obscene comments upon seeing them and provoke them for scuffle. He further stated that he and his family apprehend threat of his life and property from the hands of Subash Chawla, Tarun Chawla, Meena Chawla, Jai Prakash, Tarun Chawla's wife, Ranveer and both the sons of Jai Parkash."

4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present FIR. Petitioner was neither present at the spot nor any specific attribution has been given to her. The petitioner's counsel prays for bail by imposing any stringent conditions including surrender of fire arms, if any. In case, she repeats the offence or commit any offence where the sentence is more than 07 years, she would have no objection, if State files an application for cancellation of her bail. He further contends that pre-trial incarceration would cause an irreversible injustice to the petitioner and their family.

5. The State's counsel opposes bail and refers to the reply and submits that they be given right to file cancellation of bail, in case, petitioner repeats the offence.

6. It would be appropriate to refer to the following portions of the reply, which read as follows:

*"15. **The role of the petitioner:** That as per the statement of petitioner, he was given beatings by the other co-accused on 06.06.2025, due to which, he was admitted in AP*



Jain Hospital, Rajpura. Thereafter, on 07.06.2025, Ranveer and both the sons of Prakash and Tarun Chawla’s wife Geeta Rani (petitioner) passed obscene comments upon seeing the wife of complainant and provoked her to engage in scuffle.”

7. Counsel for the complainant also opposes bail on the same ground and also submitted that bail of co-accused has already been dismissed.

REASONING:

8. Allegations against the petitioner are that she only passed obscene comments upon seeing the wife of the complainant and provoked her to engage in scuffle. Bail of co-accused has already been dismissed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 08.07.2025, however, against those co-accused were allegations of beating. Given the role of petitioner and she is a woman, no ground for custodial interrogation is made out.

9. The evidence might be prima facie sufficient to launch prosecution or to frame charges, but this Court is not considering the evidence at that stage, but is analyzing it for the stage of anticipatory bail.

10. Given the above, the penal provisions invoked coupled with the prima facie analysis of the nature of allegations, petitioner is a woman and the other factors peculiar to this case, there would be no justifiability for custodial interrogation or the pre-trial incarceration at this stage.

11. The investigation indicates that the petitioners is not the main accused, so the petitioner's bail shall not be treated as a precedent for granting bail to the other co-accused with a higher role.

12. Without commenting on the case's merits, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, and for the reasons mentioned above, the petitioner makes a case for bail. This order shall come into force from the time it is uploaded on this Court's official webpage.

CONDITIONS:

13. Given above, provided the petitioner is not required in any other case, the petitioner shall be released on bail in the FIR captioned above subject to furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, and if the matter is before a Court, then the concerned Court and due to unavailability before any nearest Ilaqa Magistrate/duty Magistrate. Before accepting the surety, the concerned Officer/Court must be satisfied that if the accused fails to appear, such surety can produce the accused.

14. While furnishing a personal bond, the petitioner shall mention the following personal identification details:

1.	AADHAR number	
2.	Passport number (If available) and when the attesting officer/court considers it appropriate or considers the accused a flight risk.	
3.	Mobile number (If available)	
4.	E-Mail id (If available)	



15. This order is subject to the petitioner's complying with the following terms. The petitioner shall abide by all statutory bond conditions and appear before the concerned Court(s) on all dates. The petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence, influence, browbeat, pressurize, induce, threaten, or promise, directly or indirectly, any witnesses, Police officials, or any other person acquainted with the facts and circumstances of the case or dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Police or the Court.

16. The petitioner is directed to join the investigation within seven days of uploading this order on the official webpage of the High Court of Punjab and Haryana and as and when called by the Investigator. The petitioner shall be in deemed custody for Section 27 of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872/ Section 23 of BSA, 2023. The petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer or any Superior Officer and shall cooperate with the investigation at all further stages as required. In the event of failure to do so, the prosecution will be open to seeking cancellation of the bail. During the investigation, the petitioner shall not be subjected to third-degree, indecent language, inhuman treatment, etc.

17. In case the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge of the concerned Police Station arraigns another section of any penal offense in this FIR, and if the new section prescribes a maximum sentence that is not greater than the sections mentioned above, then this bail order shall be deemed to have also been passed for the newly added section(s). However, suppose the newly inserted sections prescribe a sentence exceeding the maximum sentence prescribed in the sections mentioned above; then, in that case, the Investigator/Officer-In-Charge shall give the petitioner notice of a minimum of seven days, providing an opportunity to avail the remedies available in law.

18. Any observation made hereinabove is neither an expression of opinion on the case's merits nor shall the trial Court advert to these comments.

19. A certified copy of this order would not be needed for furnishing bonds, and any Advocate for the Petitioner can download this order along with case status from the official web page of this Court and attest it to be a true copy. If the attesting officer wants to verify its authenticity, such an officer can also verify its authenticity and may download and use the downloaded copy for attesting bonds.

20. Petition allowed in terms mentioned above. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

18.08.2025
renubala

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

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