



CRM-M-62868-20251

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
210

CRM-M-62868
Decided on: November 14, 2025

Meera @ Mira
.....Petitioner
Versus
State of Haryana
.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Abhimanu Jangra, Advocate,
for Mr. Arman Goyal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pawan Kumar Jhanda, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

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 hereunder:-

Name of Petitioner	FIR No.	Date	Section(s)	Police Station	District
Meera @ Mira, aged 42 years	63	08.03.2025	308(2), 308(6) and 61 of BNS, 2023	Uchana	Jind

2. As per the allegations in the FIR (supra), complainant – Sudesh has alleged that one FIR No. 5, dated 08.01.2025, under Sections 64, 351(2) BNS and Section 3(2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, was got lodged by Meera



(petitioner herein) against Manish (son of the complainant – Sudesh). Thereupon, petitioner and her family members started demanding a sum of Rs. 9,00,000/-, saying that in case the amount is paid, they would not depose in the criminal case already registered against Manish, i.e. FIR No. 5, dated 08.01.2025 (supra). Further alleged in the present FIR that due to the said demand, an amount of Rs. 50,000/- was paid to Meera (petitioner herein), and Rs. 50,000/- was paid to co-accused Sandeep. Apart this, on the date of lodging of the FIR, i.e. 08.03.2025, remaining amount of Rs.8,00,000/- was demanded by Meera and co-accused Virender @ Balinder, from the complainant and his nephew Pradeep.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that co-accused Virender @ Balinder has been granted bail on 02.06.2025 (Annexure P-4); co-accused Jasmer @ Pundu has been granted bail on 07.07.2025 (Annexure P-5); and co-accused Sandeep has been granted bail on 15.07.2025 (Annexure P-6), by the Court of Sessions. Further points out that the petitioner is in custody since 08.03.2025, and out of total 17 prosecution witnesses, only one has been examined till date. Therefore, trial is not likely to be culminated in near future.

Thus, prays that by applying the principle of parity, present petitioner – Meera @ Mira also deserves the concession of bail, because she has been assigned similar role.

3. On the other hand, learned State counsel while opposing the bail, submits that petitioner is the main accused, who has demanded and then accepted the amount of extortion for the purpose of not to depose in the Court against the son of the complainant in an earlier FIR No. 5,



dated 08.01.2025 (supra). In fact, the process of law has been misused by the petitioner alongwith other co-accused, and she deserves no leniency in the matter of grant of bail.

4. I have considered the submissions, gone through the record and the orders (Annexures P-4 to P-6) passed by the Court of Sessions, granting bail to the other co-accused, namely, Virender @ Balinder, Jasmer @ Pundu and Sandeep. This Court also notices that the petitioner is inside jail for the last more than 08 months, and looking at the aspect that out of total 17, only one prosecution witness has been examined so far, there are bleak chances of early culmination of trial. Undoubtedly, it would also be an issue whether instant case has been got registered as a counter blast to FIR No. 05, dated 08.01.2025, which was lodged against the son of the complainant Sudesh, by the petitioner's side or actually the incident of extortion had happened.

5. In totality of the facts and circumstances, I am convinced with the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, and am of the view that the petitioner, who is woman, cannot be detained in custody for an indefinite period, and deserves the concession of bail.

6. Consequently, prayer made in the present petition is **allowed**. Petitioner is ordered to be released on bail, subject to her 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. Any of the discussion done and recorded hereabove, shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case. Therefore, Trial Court is expected to decide the case by taking an independent view, on the basis of evidence available on record, as expeditiously as possible, in accordance with law.
9. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 14, 2025
Pkapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: YES/NO