



CRM-M-56622-2025

1

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

116

CRM-M-56622-2025

Decided on :07.04.2026

Pooja

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mrs. Santosh Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Parveen Kumar, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

-.-

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 483(2) read with Section 528 of BNSS, seeking cancellation of regular bail granted to respondent No.2 by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonipat vide order dated 05.06.2025 in case FIR No.27 dated 22.01.2025, under Sections 109(1), 118(1), 351(2), 118(2) of BNS, registered at Police Station Sadar Gohana, District Sonipat, Haryana.

2. The factual aspects recorded in paragraph No. 2 of the order dated 05.06.2025, whereby respondent No. 2 (husband of the petitioner) was granted bail, reads as under:

“2. FIR in this case came to be registered on the complaint of Kanta (hereinafter referred to as complainant), mother of victim-injured-Pooja, wherein she alleged that her daughter-Pooja was married to Tinku (petitioner) in year 2012 and they have three children from the wedlock. Since beginning Tinku used to harass Pooja, but still every effort was made to settle their married life. On account of this, they have strained



relationship. On 29.12.2024 at about 6.30 p.m. complainant's daughter-Pooja went away from her matrimonial house, regarding which missing report was filed vide FIR No.493 dated 30.12.2024 at Police Station Sadar,Gohana. After that on 12.01.2025 she returned to her matrimonial house and with her consent the said case was cancelled. From that day, the complainant has been residing with Pooja at village Bhichpari. Nursing grudge on account of which, on 22.01.2025 at about 2.00 p.m. Tinku attacked Pooja with a sharp edged weapon with intention to kill her and inflicted injuries to her. When the complainant tried to save her daughter, Tinku also ran after her to kill. The complainant managed to run away from there and saved her life, but she witnessed the incident. Her daughter-Pooja was not able to make statement, thus legal action was sought against Tinku.”

3. While granting regular bail to respondent No. 2, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, recorded that the petitioner had been living in a live-in relationship with her own nephew for several months and had abandoned her three minor daughters without any support. As per the allegations, the petitioner sustained a total of 23 injuries, allegedly inflicted by respondent No. 2 on 22.01.2025, and the said incident was witnessed by none other than petitioner's mother.

However, while appearing as a witness before the Court, petitioner's real mother did not support the case of the prosecution, which was primarily based on the statement of petitioner-Pooja. Consequently, petitioner's mother was declared hostile. Not only this, she also provided an alternative explanation for the injuries sustained by the petitioner, stating that while leaving the house, petitioner fell from her scooty due

**CRM-M-56622-2025****3**

to fog and met with an accident after colliding with a harrow (cultivation equipment).

4. Upon considering the reasons assigned in the bail order dated 05.06.2025, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition seeking cancellation of bail granted to respondent No. 2. It is well settled that there are specific parameters under which bail may be cancelled. In the present case, there are no allegations requiring examination to the effect that petitioner is facing any threat at the instance of respondent No. 2, nor is there any material to suggest that the concession of bail has been misused by him.

Accordingly, while maintaining the bail order dated 05.06.2025, present petition is hereby dismissed.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

07.04.2026***Rashmi***

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*