

**In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana, at Chandigarh****Criminal Misc. No. M-11051 of 2026****Date of Decision: 22.04.2026**

Parveen Kumari

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Surya Partap Singh.Present: Mr. Samay Singh Sandhawalia, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).Mr. Ramender Singh Chauhan, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana, for the respondent.Dr. Pankaj Nanhera, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Rahul Gautam, Mr. Navneet Sharma and
Mr. Anurag Mor, Advocates, for the complainant.**Surya Partap Singh, J.**

1. This petition for anticipatory bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No. 13 dated 16.01.2026, for the commission of offence punishable under Section(s) 115, 126, 3(5), 324(4) and 351(3) [Sections 110, 61(2), 190, 191(3) and 238 were added later on] of 'the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023' Police Station Civil Lines, Sonipat, District Sonipat, Haryana.

2. Vide order dated 25.02.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall

3. Heard.

4. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 25.02.2026, the petitioner has already joined the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 25.02.2026 be made absolute.

5. The learned State counsel, along with learned senior counsel for the complainant, has controverted the above-mentioned arguments on the ground that the offence is serious in nature, and that for proper investigation of the case custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. With regard to fact-situation of this case and the above-mentioned arguments, following are the relevant factors which are supposed to be taken into consideration:-

- i) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation;
- ii) that the petitioner cannot be forced to assist the prosecuting agency for the recovery of incriminating material which may harm her interests or may amount to defeat her right of defence;
- iii) that nothing significant has to be recovered in this case with the assistance of petitioner to link her with the commission of crime;

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the petitioner has already joined the investigation, it is hereby ordered that the petitioner is entitled for anticipatory bail. Hence, the present petition is

hereby **allowed** and the order dated 25.02.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute.

(Surya Partap Singh)
Judge

April 22, 2026
“DK”

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No