

2025:PHHC:105372



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

225

CRM M-43197 of 2025

Date of Decision: 13.08.2025

Vina

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S.SHEKHAWAT

Present : Mr. Sahil Chaudhary, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Parmod Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

N.S.SHEKHAWAT, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner has filed the second petition under Section 483 of B.N.S.S., 2023 with a prayer to grant a regular bail in case FIR No.358 dated 29.10.2024 registered under Sections 140(3), 140(2), 351(2), (3), 3(5) of BNS at Police Station Baldev Nagar, District Ambala, Haryana.

2. As per the allegations levelled by the complainant, the petitioner in connivance with Sunny Kumar, co-accused had allegedly abducted a 69 years old lady for ransom on 28.10.2024. However, it was further alleged that a ransom of 12 lakhs was also demanded, after planning abduction. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends

that in fact the petitioner is a poor lady and has been victimized by the complainant. Even, as per the case of the prosecution itself, the present petitioner had allegedly returned with victim only on the next day and now the alleged victim is residing with her family. Learned counsel further contends that in fact the petitioner had served the alleged victim and could not even think of abducting the victim. The petitioner was arrested in the present case on 29.10.2024 and is in custody for the last 09 months. Learned counsel further contends that after completion of investigation the *challan* has been presented against the petitioner. Moreover, during the course of trial, only two witnesses have been examined so far and the conclusion of the trial may take quite a long time.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioner on the ground that there are serious allegations against the petitioner and the petitioner is not entitled for the concession of regular bail.

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

5. In the present case, the petitioner is stated to be in custody for the last more than 09 months. Even, two material witnesses have been examined by the prosecution and the evidence is yet to be allowed to prove the involvement of the petitioner.

Moreover, the petitioner was never involved in any other criminal activity.

6. In view of the above, without commenting any further on the merits, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned.

13.08.2025

amit rana

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)

JUDGE

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