

2026.PHHC.015615



CRM-M-53627-2025 and  
CRM-M-39622-2025

-1-

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

214(2 cases)

Date of decision: 03.02.2026

CRM-M-53627-2025

REENA

vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

CRM-M-39622-2025

SANDEEP SINGH

vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Parveen Moudgil, Advocate,  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-53627-2025.

Mr. K.S.Dhaliwal, Advocate,  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-39622-2025.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG, Haryana.

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)**

1. Prayer in the present petitions filed under Section 483 of BNSS is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.96 dated 17.04.2025, registered at Police Station Narwana City, District Jind, under Sections 115(2), 117(2), 126(2), 127(2), 140(2), 308(6), 351(3) and 61(2) of BNS.

2. Learned counsel contends that the petitioners have been in custody for 9 months and 14 days. They allege false implication. The name of petitioner-Sandeep Singh surfaced based on the disclosure statement of petitioner-Reena, who was named in the FIR. There is a delay of 2 days in lodging the FIR. Co-accused similarly circumstanced, namely, Sukhvinder Singh has since been granted bail by this Court, vide

CRM-M-53627-2025 and  
CRM-M-39622-2025

order dated 08.12.2025, after being in custody of more than 7 months. As per the allegations, the petitioners and other co-accused had taken the complainant to the bank as also to the commission agent for taking ransom. No recovery has been effected from them. No test identification parade was conducted. Charges have been framed on 25.08.2025, however, only 1 PW stands examined, out of 22. Petitioner-Reena is not involved in any other case whereas petitioner-Sandeep in 2 other cases wherein he is on bail. Reliance is placed on the judgment passed by Hon'ble The Supreme Court titled as **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi vs. State of U.P. and others**, 2012(2) SCC 382.

3. The custody certificates dated 02.02.2026, filed by the learned State counsel are taken on record. As per the same, the petitioners are behind bars for 9 months and 14 days.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the bail on the ground that there are specific allegations against petitioner-Reena that she had conspired with other co-accused for abducting the complainant for the purpose of ransom. However, he is unable to controvert the submissions with regard to stage of the case; co-accused having been released on bail and petitioner-Reena being not involved in any other case whereas petitioner-Sandeep Singh being on bail in other cases.

5. Heard.

6. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi** (Supra) had held that, "As observed by the High Court,

CRM-M-53627-2025 and  
CRM-M-39622-2025

merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court, etc.”

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, in particular that the petitioners are in custody for the last 9 months and 14 days; petitioner-Reena not involved in any other case while petitioner-Sandeep being on bail in other cases; co-accused is on bail; charges were framed on 25.08.2025, however, only 1 PW has been examined and there are still 21 more to go; the trial is likely to take a considerable time, further incarceration of the petitioner would be violative of their right enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, the present petitions are allowed.

8. The petitioners are ordered to be released on regular bail, subject to furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case and shall abide by the following conditions:-

- (i) The petitioners will not tamper with the evidence during the trial.
- (ii) The petitioners will not pressurize/ intimidate the prosecution witnesses.
- (iii) The petitioners will appear before the trial Court on each and every date fixed, unless is exempted by a specific order of Court.
- (iv) The petitioners shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which, they are

CRM-M-53627-2025 and  
CRM-M-39622-2025

accused, or for commission of which they are suspected of.

- (v) The petitioners shall not directly or indirectly coerce, induce, threaten or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/ her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence in any manner.
- (vi) The petitioners shall not in any manner misuse his liberty.
- (vii) The petitioners shall furnish their addresses and mobile number by way of affidavits to the trial Court and not change the same till conclusion of trial and if for any reasons, they seek to change either of the aforesaid, it shall be done only with prior information to the learned trial Court.
- (viii) The petitioners shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (ix) The trial Court/Duty Magistrate may impose any other condition, as deemed appropriate while releasing the petitioners.

9. 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 petitioners by this order.

10. 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.

11. Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected file(s).

03.02.2026

parveen kumar

**(AMAN CHAUDHARY)**  
**JUDGE**

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