



CRM-M-33425 of 2026

-1-

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

109

CRM-M-33425 of 2026

Date of Decision: 10.06.2026

Anita Rani @ Nisha and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate (through VC)
for the petitioners.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Chinna, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.50 dated 20.06.2025 registered under Sections 6 and 17 (added later on) of POCSO Act, Sections 9, 10 of Prohibition of Child Marriage Act and Sections 115, 316(2), 351(2) and 85 of BNS, registered at Police Station Women, District Yamuna Nagar.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. He submitted that the petitioners were granted the concession of regular bail by the learned trial Court, vide orders dated 17.12.2025 and 02.01.2026 and were regularly appearing before learned trial Court. However, on 29.05.2026, the petitioners could not appear before the trial Court due to some unavoidable circumstances and they informed their counsel telephonically



to move an exemption application in this regard but inadvertently, the said exemption application could not be filed by their counsel and ultimately, the bail of the petitioners was cancelled, vide order dated 29.05.2026. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that non-appearance of the petitioners was not deliberate or intentional and they are ready and willing to join investigation as and when required by the investigating agency. Hence, he prays that the present petition be allowed.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, has opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the ground that the offence committed by the petitioners is serious in nature. Hence, they do not deserve any relief. However, he could not controvert the fact that the petitioners had earlier been granted the concession of regular bail by the learned trial Court.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioners were granted regular bail by the learned trial Court which was subsequently cancelled due to their non-appearance. In the peculiar facts of the present case, since the petitioners had earlier been granted bail and the culpability of the petitioners is a matter of trial; hence, this Court is taking a lenient view.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. The petitioners shall also continue to abide by the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.



CRM-M-33425 of 2026

-3-

7. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.06.2026

D.Bansal

**(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE**

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