



107 (02 cases)

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

1. CRM-M-60504-2025

Veena Yadav

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

2. CRM-M-62520-2025

Rohtash Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

Date of decision : 24.02.2026

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Bipan Ghai, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Nikhil Ghai, Advocate
Mr. Akhil Godara, Advocate and
Ms. Malini, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sumit Jain, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. By way of this common order, this Court intend to dispose of abovesaid two petitions as they have arisen out of the same FIR.

2. Present petitions have been filed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case FIR No.397 dated 18.08.2018, registered under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Sector-5, Panchkula.

3. Vide orders dated 30.10.2025 and 07.11.2025, while granting interim protection, petitioners were directed to join investigation.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners have been clandestinely implicated in multiple FIRs. It is submitted that earlier the present FIR i.e. FIR No.397 dated 18.08.2018



CRM-M-60504-2025
CRM-M-62520-2025

-2-

and FIR No.440 dated 24.08.2020 were registered and untraced report were sent by the investigating agencies in both the cases. It is submitted that on the basis of the same allegations, other 03 FIRs i.e. FIR Nos.18, 19 and 20 dated 01.05.2024 were registered in which petitioner-Rohtash Singh (in CRM-M-62520-2025) was arrested and granted bail by learned Sessions Judge, Narnaul vide order dated 17.09.2024. It is submitted that hereinafter the earlier FIR i.e. FIR No.397 dated 18.08.2018 and FIR No.440 dated 24.08.2020 were re-opened by the prosecution in a clandestine manner. It is submitted that though interim bail granted to petitioner-Veena Yadav (in CRM-M-60504-2025) was declined by this Court, however, Hon'ble the Supreme Court vide its order dated 21.11.2025 has granted the anticipatory bail to petitioner-Veena Yadav. It is submitted that the petitioners, now, have been granted interim bail by this Court dated vide orders dated 30.10.2025 and 07.11.2025, respectively and they have joined the investigation and as such their interim bail may be made absolute.

5. Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Raj Karan, though has affirmed the fact that the petitioners have joined the investigation, however, he opposed the same on the ground that they have not co-operated. It is submitted that the factum regarding the interim bail having been granted to petitioner-Veena Yadav by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is not under dispute.

6. In view of the above, interim orders dated 30.10.2025 and 07.11.2025 are made absolute subject to compliance of conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.

7. Petitions stand allowed.

8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case.

24.02.2026

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

ps-I

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