



241

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

CRM-M-45562-2025

Date of decision : 03.11.2025

Kajal**.....Petitioner****versus****State of Haryana****..... Respondent****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present :- Ms. Mehak Sawhney, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Diya Sodhi, Senior DAG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present second petition praying for grant of regular bail to her in case FIR No.0053 dated 09.02.2024, under Sections 302/34 of IPC (Section 34 dropped and 120-B, 201, 392 and 397 of IPC, introduced in the final report), registered at Police Station Civil Lines Kaithal, District Kaithal.
2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that the FIR in the present case was lodged on the statement of complainant Naresh @ Sunita wife of Satish on 09.02.2024. It was alleged that her husband Satish was approximately of the age of 45 years and was running his own plastic granule manufacturing factory from the last about 05 years. 3-4 workers used to work in the factory. On 08.02.2024 at about 9:00 PM, she spoke to her husband Satish who informed her that he had taken tea and was feeling nausea. Ankit and his wife Kajal (petitioner) also worked in the factory. Ajay and Kajal told her that Satish had taken medicine and tonight he would sleep in the factory itself. Later on, she found the phone of her husband to be switched off. In the morning at about 06:00 AM, she tried



to contact her husband however, again found his phone as switched off. Later on, the police came to her house and informed that her husband died in the factory. On reaching the factory, she saw the body of her husband lying on the cot. She suspected Ankit, Ajay and Kajal to be the persons who murdered her husband. They had also taken away the DVR of the CCTV cameras installed in the factory and her husband mobile phone was also found to be missing. Request was made to take legal action against the accused. On registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, the supplementary statement of the complainant was recorded on 10.02.2024 wherein it was alleged that the petitioner though used to work in the factory, however, a month prior to the occurrence, she left the job from the factory. Petitioner was arrested on 15.02.2024. On completion of the investigation, challan was presented. On framing of the charges, the trial commenced. Petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Kaithal praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing counsel for both the sides, the same was declined vide order dated 16.01.2025. Being aggrieved, petitioner earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-8819-2025 for grant of regular bail however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 08.04.2025. Hence, this is the second petition filed by the petitioner praying for grant of regular bail.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She submits that Ankit (husband of the petitioner) is co-accused in the present case and the petitioner being the wife of Ankit has been falsely implicated. She also submits that false implication upon the petitioner is



evident from the fact that in the initial version when the FIR was registered, petitioner was alleged to be along with co-accused in the alleged murder of Satish however in the supplementary statement recorded on 10.02.2024, it was stated by the complainant herself that petitioner had already left the job of the factory a month prior to the occurrence. She thus, submits that the petitioner had never participated in the alleged occurrence as per the case of the prosecution and hence, the only allegation against her is that she was part of the conspiracy hatched with. She submits that the petitioner is behind bars since the date of her arrest and presently, she is living in the jail along with two minor children. She submits that petitioner has no criminal antecedents and the trial would take sufficient long time and hence, she deserves to be granted bail.

4. Status report by way of affidavit of Mr. Sushil Parkash, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police (Crime), Kaithal filed by learned State counsel is taken on record. She however, has opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner. She submits that petitioner was working in the factory along with her husband. She further submits that all the accused in a well hatched conspiracy has eliminated the owner of the factory i.e. Satish (husband of complainant). She submits that during investigation, recovery of the cash amount looted from the factory had also been recovered from the petitioner. On instructions, she submits that out of 18 prosecution witnesses, 04 witnesses only have been examined. She thus, submits that petitioner does not deserve to be granted the concession of regular bail.

5. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that petitioner though was alleged to be one of the



accused at the time of occurrence however in the supplementary statement it has been stated that she had left the job from the factory a month prior to the occurrence. Custody certificate filed by the State shows that petitioner has undergone the actual sentence of 01 year 08 months and 15 days as on 29.10.2025. It further reflects that there is no other case pending against the petitioner. It has been brought to the notice of this Court that 02 minor children of the petitioner are also living with her presently in the jail. Only 04 witnesses have been examined till date.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. However, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

03.11.2025
m.sharma

(**RAJESH BHARDWAJ**)
JUDGE

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