



CRM-M-22879-2026

-1-

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

154

CRM-M-22879-2026

Date of decision : 27.04.2026

ARVEENA SHARMA

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

... RESPONDENT

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

Present:- Mr. Harpal Singh Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

H.S. Grewal, J.(Oral)

1. This petitioner has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. (now Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023) seeking permission to the petitioner to furnish one/common surety or her personal bail bonds for the following seven FIRs' i.e.

“(i) FIR No. 210 dated 18.09.2024, registered under Section 420 and 406 IPC (now Section 318(4) and 316(2) of BNS 2023), P.S. Model Town, Hoshiarpur;

(ii) FIR No. 139 dated 02.12.2024, registered under Section 420, 406 IPC (now Section 318(4) and 316(2) of BNS 2023), and 13 of PTP Act, P.S. Division 7, Jalandhar;

(iii) FIR No. 0057 dated 31.03.2025, registered under Section 316(2) and 318(4) BNS, (earlier Section 420 and 406 of IPC), P.S. Sadar Hoshiarpur;



CRM-M-22879-2026

-2-

(iv) FIR No. 84 dated 18.06.2025, registered under Section 316(2) and 318(4) BNS (earlier Section 420 and 406 of IPC), and 13 of PTP Act, P.S. Badali Ala Singh, Fatehgarh Sahib;

(v) FIR No. 084 dated 21.06.2025, registered under Section 318(4) BNS (earlier Section 420 of IPC), and 13 PTP Act, P.S. A Division-2, Amritsar;

(vi) FIR No. 0012 dated 16.01.2025, registered under Section 420 and 406 IPC, (now Section 318(4) and 316(2) of BNS 2023), P.S. City Rupnagar; and

(vii) FIR No. 0130 dated 28.06.2025, registered under Section 420 IPC (now Section 318(4) BNS 2023), and 14 Immigration Act, P.S. Sadar Ludhiana.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, who is the sole accused in all the aforesaid FIR(s), has already been granted bail in all the cases. He has referred to the orders of the trial Court as well as this Court in this regard at Annexures P-1 to P-7 respectively. It is submitted that the petitioner is required to furnish sureties/bail bonds to the satisfaction of the ld. trial Court. However, it is impossible for the petitioner to arrange separate sureties/bail bonds in all the cases. It is further submitted that the petitioner wishes to appear before the trial Court and contest the case and does not want to evade the process of law. Learned counsel has placed reliance upon the judgments passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No(s) 8914-8915/2018, titled Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh, decided on 29.10.2018*** and ***Girish Gandhi vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors., 2024 AIR Supreme Court 4396***. He,



therefore, prays that the petitioner may be allowed to furnish a common set of sureties/bail bonds in all the aforesaid 07 FIR(s).

3. Notice of motion.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. P.S. Pandher, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent/State.

5. I have heard the counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

6. A perusal of the record shows that the petitioner is involved in 07 FIR(s) of similar nature and is required to furnish bail bonds in all the cases.

The relevant portion of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky's case (Supra)*** is as follows:-

“xxx xxx xxx

However, by the impugned order, the High Court has modified the conditions of bail imposed by the Trial Court in the instant cases by directing the Trial Court to accept one common surety for all the cases and one surety each for the 31 cases.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even though the Court has granted bail to the petitioner, the petitioner is unable to execute the bail bonds because of the onerous conditions of bail imposed particularly the condition of producing 31 sureties.

Considering the submissions, the impugned order is modified to the extent that the petitioner shall execute a personal bond for Rs.30,000/- (Rupees Thirty thousand only) and the same bond shall hold good for all 31 cases. There shall be two sureties who shall execute the bond for Rs. 30,000/- which bond shall hold good for all the 31 cases. It is clarified that the personal bond so executed by the Petitioner and the bond so executed by the two sureties shall hold good for all the 31 cases.

With these observations, the Special Leave Petitions are disposed of.”

7. Thus, keeping in view the fact that the condition of furnishing separate sureties would be highly onerous, and as per the ratio laid down in the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Hani Nishad @ Mohammad Imran @ Vikky's case (supra)***, the present petition is disposed of



CRM-M-22879-2026

-4-

with a direction to the learned trial Court to release the petitioner on bail upon her executing a common set of bail bond and surety in respect of the aforesaid 07 FIRs.

27.04.2026
Sonia

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

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