



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

108

CRM-M-72048-2025

Date of Decision:19.05.2026

MANPREET KAUR

.....PETITIONER

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA

.....RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present:- Ms. Divya Gulati, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Puneeta Sethi, Additional AG, Haryana.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanita, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.0200 dated 01.07.2025, under Sections 109(1), 351(3) of BNS, later on added Section 62(2), 238 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Mahesh Nagar, District Ambala.

2. Succinctly, the brief facts of the case are that on 29.06.2025 complainant namely Preeti wife of Ankit was present at he home and her husband and son had gone to Saha on motorcycle. At about 05:00 PM, a boy named Sahil, known to her husband came and asked about her husband stating that he had to clear account of money with her husband. Thereafter, Sahil attacked the complainant with a knife which hit on her arm, throat and chest with intention to kill her. She snatched the knife and raised alarm whereupon Sahil fled away from the spot giving threat to kill her husband. Thus, the request was made to take legal action against the accused. On the basis of the



same, the FIR was registered. On registration of the FIR, the investigation commenced. The petitioner was arrested on 09.07.2025. The petitioner approached the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala praying for the grant of bail. However, after hearing both the sides and finding no merit in the same, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala dismissed the bail application filed by the petitioner vide order dated 27.10.2025. Hence being aggrieved, the petitioner is before this Court praying for the grant of regular bail by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case. She has submits that as is evident from the case of the prosecution the allegations of causing injuries to the complainant are against the co-accused-Sahil. She submits that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR nor any role has been attributed to her, however, she has been impleaded in the present case on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused, namely Sahil, which in itself is not even an admissible evidence. She has further submitted that petitioner has no criminal antecedents and she is behind bars for last more than 10 months. She has submitted that in the facts and circumstances, the petitioner deserves to be granted regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel has opposed the submissions made by the counsel for the petitioner and submits that the petitioner is in relationship with the husband of the complainant and in a well hatched conspiracy, at the behest of petitioner and complainant's husband, co-accused Sahil had caused injuries to the complainant. She submits that there are CDR details which proves the complicity of the petitioner. On instructions from SI



Bhupinder Singh, she submits that examination in chief of the complainant has been conducted however his cross examination is remaining. He has produced the custody certificate of the petitioner on record.

5. After hearing counsel for the parties and perusing the record. It is deciphered that neither the petitioner was named in the FIR nor any role has been attributed to her, however, she has been arrayed as an accused on the basis of disclosure statement of co-accused. The petitioner has been alleged to be conspirator of the offence. As per custody certificate, the petitioner has suffered an incarceration of 10 months and 8 days as on 17.05.2026. It further reflects that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents. Co-accused, whom against there are allegations of causing injuries are already behind bars.

6. The veracity of the allegations would be assessed only after conclusion of the trial and on the appreciation of evidence to be led by both the parties before the trial Court.

7. The trial of the case will take sufficiently long time. Thus, keeping in view the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that learned counsel for the petitioner succeeds in making out a case for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court/Duty Magistrate. Nothing said herein shall be treated as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

19.05.2026

pry	Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
	Whether Reportable	Yes/No