



CRM-M-2996-2026

1

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

113

CRM-M-2996-2026

Date of Decision: 11.02.2026

Anu Ohri

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL.

Present: Mr. Ravinder Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS read with Article 226 and 227 of Constitution of India seeking declaration to the effect that the “conditional bail” termed in the order dated 11.09.2025 passed in bail proceedings arising out of FIR no. 162 dated 27.06.2025 registered at Police Station Central, Faridabad under Sections 420,406 and 506 IPC by the Court of Id. JMIC, Faridabad is “regular bail with statutory conditions” as otherwise the order dated 11.09.2025 and the consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted bail vide order dated 11.09.2025. He further submits that the bail was granted subject to certain conditions and that, subsequently, respondent No. 2 filed an application seeking cancellation of bail on the ground that the petitioner failed to comply with the purported MOU dated 19.09.2025 executed between the parties after the bail order. The said application is presently pending before the learned trial Court. It is further

**CRM-M-2996-2026****2**

submitted that it is not even the case of respondent No. 2 that the petitioner has violated any condition of the bail order. In support of his contentions, reliance has been placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gajanan Dattatray Gore vs. State of Maharashtra and others*, 2025 INSC 913.**

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Mr. Sanyam Khetarpal, Advocate, has appeared and filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant in Court today, which is taken on record. They have vehemently opposed the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner and has prayed for dismissal of the present petition.

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

6. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, and particularly the fact that the application seeking cancellation of bail is still pending before the learned trial Court, this Court is of the opinion that the present petition has been filed prematurely. Accordingly, no ground is made out to interfere with the order dated 11.09.2025 passed by the learned trial Court. Hence, the present petition is dismissed. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach this Court after the final order on the cancellation application is passed, if she so desired.

11.02.2026*renu***(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No