



CRM-M-19234-2026

143
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-19234-2026
Date of decision: 08.04.2026**

SUNITA RANI **...PETITIONER**
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA **...RESPONDENT**

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S.GREWAL,J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding Section 438 Cr.P.C) seeking anticipatory bail for the petitioner in FIR No. 67 dated 27.02.2026 under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 61(2), 340(2) of BNS, 2023 (406,420,468,467, 120-B, 471 of IPC) registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala.
2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with his co-accused hatched a criminal conspiracy and prepared a forged documents i.e. agreement to sell by forging the signatures of the complainant.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that matter has been compromised with the complainant and they have resolved their dispute. He has produced a copy of the compromise in the Court and the same is taken on record. The petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation.
4. Notice of motion.
5. Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and has vehemently opposed the prayer made by the ld.



CRM-M-19234-2026

counsel for the petitioner on the ground that specific role has been attributed to the petitioner.

6. Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate appears and filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of the complainant in the Court today and the same is taken on record. He has not disputed the factum of compromise between the parties and submits that he has no objection if the bail is granted to the petitioner.

7. I have heard the submissions made by Id. counsel for the parties and perused the record.

8. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the fact that matter has been compromised between the parties and the petitioner is ready and willing to join the investigation, this Court finds no reason to deny the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when required by the Investigating Officer and to abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

08.04.2026
renu

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No