



CRM-M-8086-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-8086-2026
Decided on: 11.05.2026

Shalu Mahant @ Shallu Mahant

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.0023 dated 22.01.2026, under Sections 115(2) (323 of IPC), 118(1) (324 of IPC), 351(2) (506 of IPC), 190 (149 of IPC), 191(3) (148 of IPC) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Dehlon, District Ludhiana.

2. On 12.02.2026, following order was passed:

“(i) xx xx xx xx

(ii) *Learned counsel for the petitioners, inter alia, contends that total eleven accused have been named in the present FIR, namely:- (1) Heena Mahant alias Vidyarthi Rao (petitioner herein), (2) Sheetal Mahant, (3) Shallu Mahant (petitioner herein), (4) Chatti Mahant, (5) Mehar Mahant, (6) Chela Rechna Mahant, (7) Prince, (8) Honey, (9) Sona Marasi, (10) Gulzar Marasi, and (11) Bunty Marasi. It is submitted that the alleged occurrence took place on 20.01.2026, and FIR was registered at the instance of the complainant, Mona*



Mahant alias Chela Ravina Mahant.

(iii) Counsel for the petitioners further submits that all the accused persons and complainant party belong to the transgender community, and dispute arose with regard to the collection of 'badhai' on the occasion of certain good news in the locality.

As per the allegations in the FIR, a scuffle took place between the parties. It is contended that petitioner-Shalu Mahant alias Shallu Mahant has not been attributed any specific injury. As regards petitioner-Vidharthi Rao alias Heena Mahant, a simple injury with a sharp-edged weapon is alleged to have been inflicted upon Sohana Mahant on the left bicep. No grievous or lifethreatening injury has been attributed to either of the petitioners. Thus, counsel prays for the grant of concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in the present case.

(iv) Notice of motion.

(v) On advance notice, Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab, puts in appearance on behalf of the respondent – State, and seeks some time to file status report in the matter.

(vi) Adjourned to 11.05.2026.

(vii) Meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation as and when required to do so by the Investigating Agency. In the event of their arrest, the petitioners shall be released on ad-interim bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

(viii) Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioners would seek prior permission of the Court.

(ix) A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case."

3. Learned State counsel on instructions submits that the petitioner has joined the investigation on 28.04.2026, and as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 12.02.2026 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.



CRM-M-8086-2026

5. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.
6. However, present order would be subject to the submission of his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, he would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.
7. It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

11.05.2026

reena

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

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