



CRM-M-49594 of 2025

-1-

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

230

**CRM-M-49594 of 2025
Date of Decision: 10.09.2025**

Varsha Yadav

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL

Present: Mr. B.S. Rathee, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG, Haryana.

RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.134 dated 01.05.2024 registered under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 201 of IPC, at Police Station Sadar, District Sonipat.
2. Brief facts of the present case are that as per the prosecution, the petitioner in connivance with her brother Rahul Yadav and other co-accused, had cheated the complainant and others, for a sum of Rs.59.45 lakhs, on the pretext of providing Government jobs.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and she has no concern with the said offence. The petitioner is in custody since 04.06.2024. The investigation in the case is complete, challan stands presented and charges have also been framed. Further, co-accused Amit has already been granted the concession of



CRM-M-49594 of 2025

-2-

regular bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat, vide order dated 11.11.2024. He further submits that the trial will take a long time to conclude and no useful purpose would be served by keeping her behind the bars. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Learned State counsel, who has appeared on advance notice of the petition, filed the custody certificate of the petitioner, which is taken on record. He has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the offence committed by the petitioner is serious in nature as she is the mastermind of the alleged fraud and had cheated the innocent persons with huge amount of money and therefore, she does not deserve any leniency. He has further submitted that the petitioner is involved in multiple other cases meaning thereby she is a habitual offender.

6. This Court is sanguine of the fact that according to the proposition settled by the Apex Court in ***Dataram Singh vs. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr. 2018(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 131***, that keeping somebody behind the bars, till his guilt is proved, for an indefinite period amounts to infringement of his right to life and liberty, as enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India and is against the principle “*bail is a rule*” and “*jail is an exception*”.

7. As regards the submission of learned State counsel that petitioner is involved in other/one more criminal case(s), reference is placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Maulana Mohd. Amir Rashadi Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2012 (2) SCC 382*** in which, it is held that the facts and circumstances of the present case are to be seen while deciding a bail

**CRM-M-49594 of 2025****-3-**

application and the bail application of the petitioner cannot be rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner is involved in other/another case(s). The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced herein-below:-

"As observed by the High Court, merely on the basis of criminal antecedents, the claim of the second respondent cannot be rejected. In other words, it is the duty of the Court to find out the role of the accused in the case in which he has been charged and other circumstances such as possibility of fleeing away from the jurisdiction of the Court etc."

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties at length and after perusing the record of the case, it is evident that the petitioner is in custody for the last more than 01 year and 03 months, investigation is complete; challan stands presented; charges have also been framed, the culpability, if any, would be determined at the time of trial, and the fact that trial may take a long time to conclude, no useful purpose would be served by detaining her in further custody. Keeping the petitioner in further detention without the prospect of the trial being concluded in the near future would be violative of her rights under Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

9. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her furnishing bail bonds/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/Duty Magistrate/CJM concerned. It is clarified that nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

10.09.2025*D.Bansal*

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