

CRM-M-6367-2026

-1-

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

CRM-M-6367-2026

Date of Decision: 06.04.2026

Heena

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ


Present: Mr. Arun Singh Jhanda, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in a case FIR No.114 dated 23.03.2025, registered under Sections 25(1B), 25(8)(a), 25(8)-54-59 of Arms Act, at Police Station Sadar, Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar.


2. Succinctly, facts of the case are that on 23.03.2025 the police party while on patrolling saw a young boy coming from Kalanaur side with a backpack hanging on his waist. On suspicion, he was apprehended by the Police and on asking, he disclosed his name to be Sachin Sharma @ Golu. Search of the bag being carried by him was conducted and on conducting search, one country made pistol containing 6 live cartridges and a revolver containing 5 live cartridges alongwith Rs.13,000/- were found in the bag. He failed to produce any licence regarding the possession of the same, and thus, on registration of the FIR, he was arrested on the spot. The investigation commenced. During the investigation, complicity of the petitioner was surfaced and she was also arrayed as an accused in the present case. Resultantly, she was arrested on 19.01.2026. The petitioner approached



the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhri praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 29.01.2026. Hence, the petitioner has approached this Court praying for grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been falsely and frivolously implicated in the present case. He submits that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR, nor any recovery has been effected from her. He submits that in fourth disclosure statement made by co-accused Amarjit, the petitioner has been implicated in the present case, which is not even an admissible evidence. He further contends that co-accused Amarjit on whose disclosure statement, the petitioner was arrayed as accused, has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 19.01.2026. He further submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in one more case, however, she is on bail in the same. He, thus, has submitted that in the overall facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted bail.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently controverted the submissions made by counsel for the petitioner. It is submitted that it is a case of chance recovery. It is submitted that complicity of the petitioner was surfaced during the investigation. He submits that the petitioner has been prosecuted in one more case of the similar nature. On instructions, he has submitted that investigation is complete and challan has been presented, however, charges are yet to be framed. He has placed on record the custody



CRM-M-6367-2026

-3-

certificate of the petitioner.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, it is deciphered that the petitioner has been arrested in this case on the disclosure statement of co-accused Amarjit, who has already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court. Investigation is complete and challan has been presented. The custody certificate would show that the petitioner has suffered incarceration of 02 months & 13 days as on 01.04.2026. As per the custody certificate, the petitioner is involved in one more case, however, she is on bail in the same.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the 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 sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner.

7. 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.

8. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

06.04.2026

sharmila

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE