



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRM-M-32275-2026
Decided on: 03.07.2026

MANJEET DEVI ALIAS MANJIT DEVI

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Sankalp, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Malvika Singh, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Suresh Nain, Advocate,
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, arising out of FIR No. 161 dated 25.04.2026, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 351(3), 3(5), 110 and 117(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, Police Station Narnaund, District Hansi.

2. On 01.06.2026, following order was passed:-

"1. xxxxxx xxxxx xxxxxx

Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Ram Mehar, hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. It was stated by the complainant that on 23.04.2026 at about 5.00 P.M. he was informed that 'Baljeet' and 'Mahendra' Singh were digging a hole to fix a pole therein, and that the complainant objected to above mentioned activity, but



he was assaulted by the family members of 'Baljeet and 'Mahendra', including the petitioner.

It is the case of the prosecution that in view of abovementioned complaint, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up. As per prosecution, during the course of investigation, it has transpired that the petitioner, too, was involved in the commission of above mentioned offence, and that the role assigned to the petitioner was that she slapped the injured.

Notice of motion.

Since advance notice has already been served upon the State, Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Haryana, has appeared on behalf of respondent- State. Hence, service of notice upon the State is hereby dispensed with.

Mr. Suresh Nain, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of complainant and filed the memorandum of appearance. He undertakes to file the power of attorney by next date of hearing.

Heard.

It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that by a common order the bail application filed by co-accused 'Mahendra and the present petitioner was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge on 25.05.2026, and that the benefit of anticipatory bail has already been accorded to co-accused 'Mahendra'. It has also been contended that the role assigned to the petitioner is minor in nature and being female she deserves a considerate view.

The learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above mentioned arguments. According to learned counsel for the complainant in view of gravity of offence and the nature of injury suffered by the victim, the petitioner is not entitled to the benefit of anticipatory bail.

The record has been perused carefully.

A perusal of record shows that in the present case, following are the relevant factors which are required to be taken into consideration for a decision:-

- i) that the petitioner being lady deserves a considerate view;*
- ii) that only role assigned to he petitioner is that she slapped the petitioner, which is an act amounting to minor offence;*
- iii) that the co-accused Mahendra having similar role has already been accorded the benefit of anticipatory bail;*



iv) that no weapons has been assigned to the petitioner, and therefore, nothing has to be recovered from possession of petitioner;
v) that the investigation and trial are not likely to be concluded in near future;
vi) that the detention of petitioner in judicial lock-up is not likely to serve any purpose;
vii) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
viii) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses; and
ix) that there is nothing on record to show that while on anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the above mentioned factors, it is hereby held that the petitioner is entitled for interim anticipatory bail.

Thus, it is hereby ordered that in the event of arrest of the petitioner, she shall be released on interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. However, in the meantime, the petitioner shall join the investigation as and when called by the arresting officer. She shall also abide by the conditions as specified under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

List on 03.07.2026.

Let status report and detailed reply, if any, be filed by the State by next date.

To be shown in urgent list.”

3. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in compliance of the order dated 01.06.2026, passed by this Court, petitioner has joined the investigation, and has fully co-operated. Therefore, he prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

4. Learned State counsel has filed status report dated 27.06.2026 in the Court today and the same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.



Learned State counsel on instructions, confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioner of joining the investigation by the petitioner, and submits that as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 01.06.2026, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

However, 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.

7. Accordingly, petition stands disposed of.

However, present order would be subject to the submission of passport of the petitioner to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if she possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, she would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that she does not possess any passport.

It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

03.07.2026

Lavisha

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