



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

**138+139**

**Date of decision: 15.05.2025**

**1. CRM-M-14750-2025**

**RAJU @ RAJ KUMAR**

**....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**...Respondent**

**2. CRM-M-21260-2025**

**SAPANA RANI**

**....Petitioner**

**Versus**

**STATE OF HARYANA**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present : Mr. S.K. Goswami, Advocate  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-14750-2025.

Mr. P.S. Jammu, Advocate  
for the petitioner in CRM-M-21260-2025.

Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

**SANJAY VASHISTH. J.(Oral)**

1. By this common order both the petitions shall be disposed of. For the sake of brevity the facts are being taken from CRM-M-14750-2025.



- 2-

2. The petitioners Raju @ Raj Kumar and Sapana Rani have filed the instant petition under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioner, during the pendency of trial, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed hereunder:-

<b>FIR No.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Section(s)</b>	<b>Police Station</b>	<b>District</b>
38	31.01.2025	308(6), 231, 356(2), 61, 238 BNS, 2023	City Jind	Jind

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the allegations are such which require its proving beyond doubt, either through the electronic evidence or through the documentary evidence. Co-accused namely Niraj and Priyavart have already been released on bail by the Court below, vide orders dated 25.02.2025 and 18.02.2025. Counsel further submits that the allegations in the FIR do not appear to be absolute and correct, as there is no place in the City Jind, known as Ujjain Nagar. Involvement of the petitioners is doubtful, whether Shivani and petitioner herein namely Sapna Rani is the same person or not, is the main question before the Court below. Viz-a-viz the counsel argues that prayer for bail of accused Raju @ Raj Kumar in CRM-M-14750-2025 is covered with the bail order, which had already been passed *qua* the similarly situated accused-Neeraj.

It is also pointed out that after completion of investigation, final report has been submitted before the concerned Court and 17.05.2025 is the date fixed before the learned trial Court for framing of charges, thus, trial is yet to start. Petitioners Raju @ Raj Kumar and Sapna Rani are inside the jail since 02.02.2025



- 3-

and 01.02.2025, respectively. Prolonged incarceration is not going to serve any purpose and already two of the accused have already been released on bail.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while appearing on behalf of the respondent-State, has vehemently opposed the prayer of grant of bail to the petitioners, keeping in view the nature of allegations and the gravity of offence involved herein. He further submits that if the petitioners are granted concession of bail, there is every likelihood of their being absconding from the trial and can indulge in similar kind of activities.

5. As per the totality of circumstances, and the facts/allegations levelled against the petitioners, and the fact that challan has been presented but charges are yet to be framed, thus culmination of trial will take considerable time, therefore, I deem it appropriate to grant the concession of bail to the petitioners.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petition are **allowed**. Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

6. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

7. The observation made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

8. It is further made clear that if, in future, petitioners are directly found indulged in similar kind of activities, this order shall be deemed to be cancelled.



- 4 -

9. Both the petitions stand disposed of.
10. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of the connected case.

15.05.2025  
amandeep

(SANJAY VASHISTH)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No