



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

LPA-1972-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 11th August, 2025

GEETA DEVI ROHAL

.....*Appellant(s)*

V/s.

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....*Respondent(s)*

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA**
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR

Present Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate, and
Mr. Harnirmal Singh, Advocate,
for the applicant-appellant.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. This Appeal arises out of an order passed by the learned Single Bench dated 01.05.2025 in CRWP-3624-2025, wherein the prayer for issuing writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus has been declined.

2. Learned Single has noticed that the arrest of the appellant's husband was in connection with FIR No.449 dated 12.11.2024 under Section 420 of the IPC and Section 25 of the Banning and Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019. As such, the Writ of Habeas Corpus could not have been filed. Learned Single Judge has also observed that facts have been suppressed. Cost of ₹1,00,000/- has also been imposed upon the appellant.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the factum of husband of appellant's implication in case FIR No.449 dated 12.11.2024 was not known to her and the Writ of Habeas Corpus was filed essentially relying upon an affidavit of the Director General of Police, Haryana, as per

which implication of appellant's husband was not substantiated. It is therefore submitted that even though, this Court may have justifiably denied interference in the matter since remedy available for the appellant was to obtain protection under the Code of Criminal Procedure, yet the imposition of cost was not called for.

4. We find ourselves to be in agreement with the view taken by the learned Single Bench that the arrest having been made pursuant to appellant's implication in an FIR, remedy was to apply for bail and Habeas Corpus Petition was not maintainable. However, as the appellant contends that she was not aware of her husband's implication in FIR No.449 dated 12.11.2024 and that such fact came to her knowledge only at the time of rolling of the matter, we modify the order of the learned Single Bench and delete the part whereby cost of ₹1,00,000/- was imposed on the appellant.

5. Subject to the aforesaid modification, the present LPA stands ***disposed of.***

6. All pending applications, if any, in this case are disposed of accordingly.

**[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE**

**[ROHIT KAPOOR]
JUDGE**

August 11, 2025

Ess Kay

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>