



CRM-M-63270-2025 and
CRM-M-63642-2025

-1-

**123+134 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of Decision: 19.02.2026

CRM-M-63270-2025

Poonam Dass

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CRM-M-63642-2025

Maya

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Naveen Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-63270-2025.

Mr. P.K.S.Phoolka, Advocate
for the petitioner in CRM-M-63642-2025.

Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. This order shall dispose of above-said two petitions as both of them have arisen out of same FIR. Brief facts of case are taken from CRM-M-63270-2025.

2. This is the second petition filed by the petitioner(s) for granting of regular bail in case FIR No.150 dated 03.10.2024, under Sections 109, 115(2), 191(3), 190 BNS (Section 103/117(2) BNS added later on) registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Bathinda.



CRM-M-63270-2025 and
CRM-M-63642-2025

-2-

3. Succinctly, facts of the case are that FIR in question was lodged on 03.10.2024 on the statement of complainant Sumit Kumar wherein it was alleged that on 02.10.2024 at about 8.00 pm, when he along with his friend Tushar and Sahil was walking in the street, there a lady namely Saroj w/o Ramesh Sahni @ Rambo came from behind on her scooty and started arguing with the complainant for not giving her space to pass by in the street. Due to the same, argument shoot up and she called her family members. Thereafter, her husband namely Ramesh Sahni @ Rambo attacked Sahil with a wooden stick. He hit Sahil in the middle of his head. When the complainant went forward to rescue him, co-accused Prabhu hit on his head with the bat with an intention to kill him. When the accused party was beating the complainant and his friends, accused Poonam (petitioner), Maya (petitioner in CRM-M-63642-2025) and 7/8 unknown persons came there with sticks and gave them beatings. When the complainant and his friends raised hue and cry for their rescue, all the assailants ran away from the spot with their respective weapons. Thereafter, injured were shifted to the Civil Hospital, Bathinda for treatment. However, Sahil succumbed to the injuries. Consequently, on the statement of the complainant, FIR was registered. On the registration of the FIR, investigation commenced. During investigation, complicity of petitioners surfaced and thus, petitioners were apprehended on 03.10.2024. On completion of investigation, challan was presented and trial commenced. The petitioners approached the Court of Addl. Sessions Judge, Bathinda praying for grant of regular bail. However, after hearing both the sides, the learned Court finding no merit in the same, dismissed the bail application filed by the



CRM-M-63270-2025 and
CRM-M-63642-2025

-3-

petitioners vide orders dated 30.04.2025 and 05.03.2025 respectively. Poonam Dass (petitioner in CRM-M-63270-2025) has earlier approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-27111-2025, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 22.05.2025. Maya (petitioner in CRM-M-63642-2025) earlier has approached this Court by way of filing CRM-M-39235-2025, however, the same was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 31.07.2025. Hence, the petitioners are before this Court by way of filing present second petitions for grant of bail.

4. It has been vehemently contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case. They submit that evidently, the occurrence as alleged by the prosecution had taken place on 02.10.2024. The alleged injuries had been alleged to the co-accused and it is after the deceased having received the injuries, the petitioners had been alleged to have approached the place of occurrence. They submit that no injury had been attributed to the petitioners having been caused to the deceased. However, the allegations against them are that they were part of unlawful assembly. It is submitted that *prima facie* case under Section 103 BNS is not even made out against the petitioners. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner Poonam Dass that though she is involved in two cases under the NDPS Act, however, she is on bail. He submits that the petitioner Poonam Dass is behind bars in the present case and also has her three years old minor child. Learned counsel for the petitioner Maya submits that petitioner has been alleged only to be part of unlawful assembly. She has no criminal antecedents.



CRM-M-63270-2025 and
CRM-M-63642-2025

-4-

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel has vehemently opposed the submissions made by counsels for the petitioners and submits that the petitioners had duly participated in the occurrence in question and were duly armed as well. It is submitted that they were part of unlawful assembly and do not deserve the concession of bail. He, on instructions submits that out of total 21 witnesses, only the complainant has been partly examined.

6. On hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record, the alleged occurrence took place on 02.10.2024. The injuries to the deceased have been attributed to the co-accused. The petitioners have been alleged to be the part of unlawful assembly. They are behind bars since 03.10.2024. Custody certificate of petitioners would show that they have suffered incarceration of 01 year, 04 months and 12 days as on 19.02.2026. It further reflects that petitioner Maya is involved in one more case , however, she is on bail while petitioner Poonam Dass, who is involved in two cases under the NDPS Act, is on bail.

7. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after the conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court. This Court would refrain itself from commenting anything on the merits of the case. The trial of the case will take sufficient long time. Keeping in view the arguments raised by both the sides and perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioners succeed in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the present petitions are allowed and the petitioners



CRM-M-63270-2025 and
CRM-M-63642-2025

-5-

are ordered to be released on bail on their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate.

9. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

19.02.2026
sonia

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether Reportable :	Yes/No