

2026:PHHC:068311



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

230

CRM-M-23700-2026
Date of decision:04.05.2026

SHILPI

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. P.S. Ahluwalia, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Deepinder Singh Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the present petition filed under Section 483 BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.441 dated 11.11.2024, under Sections 103(1), 309(6) and 332(a) of the BNS, 2023 (Sections 302, 394 and 449 of IPC) registered at Police Station Sector 17, HUDA, Jagadhri at Yamunanagar.

2. Learned Senior Counsel contends that the petitioner has been in custody for the last about 01 year, 05 months and 13 days and she was implicated in the present case pursuant to her interrogation of four days; she is daughter-in-law of the complainant, who is stated to have come back alongwith him and though having found the house locked from inside, he went to the backside and entered to find his wife to have been murdered. He is retired District Attorney from the State of Haryana and had initially stated about theft of Rs.75,00,000/-, which he had got on account of sale of his plot, however, subsequently in his statement recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., he stated that no theft had taken place; it is a case of circumstantial evidence and the material witness i.e. the complainant stands examined and the husband of the petitioner

stands given up out of 37 prosecution witnesses; the petitioner is 38 years old woman having a minor child of 13 years; not involved in any other case.

3. Learned State Counsel opposes the bail on the ground that the complainant has levelled specific allegations against the petitioner of having committed the offence. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage, the complainant having been examined and the petitioner being not involved in any other case.

4. Heard.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioner is in custody for the last 01 year, 05 months and 13 days; not involved in any other case; the material witness i.e. the complainant having been examined and there being 37 prosecution witnesses, the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of her right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petition is allowed.

6. The petitioner is ordered to be released on regular bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

7. It is made abundantly clear that in case there is any breach of the aforesaid conditions, the State shall be at liberty to seek cancellation of bail as granted to the petitioner by this order.

8. In view of the above, it is clarified that the observations made herein above are limited for the purpose of present proceedings and would not be construed as any opinion on the merits of the case and the trial would proceed independently of the aforesaid observations.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

04.05.2026
Rajender

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