

2026:PHHC:020630



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M No.73826 of 2025
Date of decision: 10.02.2026

Geeta ... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana,
for the respondent-State.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
245	26.08.2025	Adarsh Nagar, District Faridabad	115, 190, 191(3), 304, 333, 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (For short "BNS") (117(2) of BNS added later on)

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition

2026:PHHC:020630



are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint submitted by the complainant Rajbati alleging that his son Rohit was married with accused Rajni in the year 2023. There was matrimonial discord between them and she had lodged a complaint against them at the police station previously. On the night of 24.08.2025, the petitioner who is mother of Rajni accompanied by the co-accused forcibly entered her house and opened an assault upon her son, daughter and herself with danda, lathi and iron rods and extended beatings to them with the same. They also gave kicks and fist blows to them and then after snatching the mobile phone of Rohit, had escaped from the spot after extending threats. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of anticipatory bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Faridabad vide order dated 18.12.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. There is delay of two days in lodging of the FIR. Previously, an FIR under Sections 323, 406 and 498 read with Section 34 of IPC was registered against the members of complainant party as they used to harass the daughter of the petitioner. Subsequently, a compromise took place between them. However, they had given merciless beatings to her daughter who was four months' pregnant, on

2026:PHHC:020630



24.08.2025 thereby causing injuries to her. She was medically examined. The petitioner and others had gone to the house of the complainant to prevail good sense upon her and members of the complainant party had quarrelled with them and then falsely implicated them in this case after two days. Many co-accused have been extended benefit of bail. No specific overt act has been attributed to her. She is ready to join investigation. Her custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from her. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Haryana has argued that there are serious allegations against the petitioner. CCTV footage of the camera installed in the house of the complainant has been seen which shows that the petitioner alone had struck as many as 18 blows with a rod upon the person of the complainant thereby causing her multiple serious injuries. The complainant had sustained multiple fractures of lower 1/3rd of ulna seen, fracture of proximal phalanx of 3rd and 4th toe of left foot and fracture of base of first metacarpal left hand. The allegations against her are serious in nature. No exceptional and extraordinary circumstance for grant of anticipatory bail is made out in her favour. Matter requires thorough investigation. The case is at its nascent stage. It is, thus, argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

2026:PHHC:020630



5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.
6. The petitioner by forming membership of an unlawful assembly with the co-accused is alleged to have criminally trespassed into the house of the complainant on fateful night and to have caused simple as well as grievous injuries on the person of the complainant. The respondent-State has placed on record pen drive of the footage of the CCTV camera installed in the house of the complainant which clearly shows the petitioner while assaulting the victim with a lathi by giving as many as 18 blows. As per the medico legal report, she had sustained multiple fractures. Given the nature of the allegations, the part attributed to the petitioner and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case for exercise of powers for grant of pre arrest bail which are required to be exercised in exceptional and extraordinary circumstance, is made out. Finding no compelling ground to allow the petition, the same is dismissed.
7. It is clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

10.02.2026
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No