



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-71466-2025

RAJNI BALA AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

Date of decision: 16.02.2026

Date of uploading: 16.02.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Kachura, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaypreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners in case bearing FIR No.120 dated 28.06.2024, under Sections 324, 323, 342, 506, 148, 149 of IPC (Section 379 of IPC deleted and Sections 326, 325, 379-B and 354 of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Guruharsahai, District Ferozepur.

2. On 13.01.2026, the following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.120 dated 28.06.2024, under Sections 324, 323, 342, 506, 148, 149 of IPC (Section 379 of IPC deleted and Sections 326, 325, 379-B and 354 of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Guruharsahai, District Ferozepur.

2. Notice of motion.

3. Mr. M.S. Toor, AAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. The parties have been heard and material on file has been perused.



4. *Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that initially the petitioners were released on anticipatory bail by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 19.03.2025 (Annexure P-6) on the basis of compromise with the complainant, who has already admitted the factum of compromise. Thereafter, a petition for quashing of FIR was also filed but the same was withdrawn as the complainant had not entered into compromise with two of the accused namely Satinder Kumar and Ranjit Kumar but had admitted the factum of compromise with the present petitioners. Now, offences under Sections 379B and 354 of IPC have also been added. Learned counsel next contended that petitioners are ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in favour of the petitioners.*

5. *On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioners do not deserve the concession of bail in view of the gravity of the offence.*

6. *Adjourned to 16.02.2026 for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation and in the event of their arrest, they shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-*

- i) that the petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat 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;*
- iii) that the petitioners shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;*
- iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”*

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 13.01.2026 the petitioners have joined investigation and are no longer required for custodial interrogation.

4. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand; especially the factum of the petitioners have joined investigation and cooperated therein and are no longer required by the State for further custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated

13.01.2026 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

- 5. Ordered accordingly.
- 6. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioners indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.
- 7. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioners violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.
- 8. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
- 9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

16.02.2026
jatin

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