

CRM-M-57606-2025

-1-

2026:PHHC:024837



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-57606-2025

Pooja @ Priya Rawat

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

Sr. No.	Particulars	Details
1	The date when the judgment is reserved	13.02.2026
2	The date when the judgment is pronounced	18.02.2026
3	The date when the judgment is uploaded on the website	
4	Whether only operative part of the judgment is pronounced or full judgment is pronounced	Full
5	The delay, if any, of the pronouncement of full judgment, and reasons thereof	Not applicable

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present: Mr. Tarun Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Rajender Kumar, Advocate for the complainant.

\*\*\*

**MANISHA BATRA, J :-**

The instant one is the second petition filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS') by the petitioner seeking grant of regular bail in case bearing FIR No. 185 dated 26.11.2024 registered under Section 108 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') at Police Station Shahzadpur, District Ambala. His previous



petition bearing CRM-M-15111-2025 had been dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 14.05.2025.

2. The aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant Surender Kumar alleging that his younger son Dimple was working as a bouncer in a hospital. He told the complainant that one Priya, resident of village Rohru, District Shimla, who was working in a shop at Ambala, had been blackmailing him and he was very tense due to the demands raised by her as he could not fulfill the same. The complainant and his wife pacified him and had conversation with Priya. About five days back, his son again shared with him that he was unable to fulfill demands of Priya and could end his life. He was again pacified by the complainant but on 25.11.2024, he consumed some pesticide by going to their agricultural fields and made a call to his mother. The complainant along with others rushed to the spot. The victim was taken to the hospital but was declared to be brought dead. By alleging that Priya had abetted suicide by his son, he prayed for taking action in the matter.


3. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. The post mortem examination of dead body of the victim was conducted. Photocopies of chats made between the victim and the petitioner on phone were collected which showed that there was continuous conversation between the petitioner, deceased, his mother and sister. It was found that the petitioner used to chat on Instagram with three different IDs. It was also revealed that the petitioner who was married to one Amrit Pal, was



in custody in connection with another case bearing FIR No. 99 dated 17.08.2024 registered under Section 306 of IPC at Police Station Rahon, SBS Nagar, Punjab and was lodged in Central Jail, Ludhiana. She was joined into investigation of this case on 01.02.2025 and was formally arrested. On interrogation, she suffered disclosure statement admitting that she was a divorcee. She had started maintaining relationship with the victim and thereafter demanding money and costly gifts from him. She used to extend threats to him that if he did not give money or gifts to her, she would involve him in a case of rape. She disclosed that when the victim had told her that he had no money to spare and was left with no alternative but to commit suicide, out of rage, she had told him to do so and then she came to know that the victim had actually committed suicide on 25.11.2024. She also disclosed that previously in a similar manner, she had been extracting money from one Makhan Singh, resident of village Lallewal, Police Station Rahon and he too had committed suicide. A case had been registered against her in that regard also. Investigation now stands completed.

4. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. She is in custody since long. She has minor children. Trial will take considerable time to conclude. There are no chances of her intimidating the witnesses or absconding. It is, therefore, argued that she deserves to be released on bail.

5. *Per contra*, learned State counsel assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently argued that the allegations against the



petitioner are serious in nature which make out a case for commission of subject offence against the petitioner. There are chances of her intimidating the witnesses or absconding if extended benefit of bail. Her antecedents are not clean. She may commit similar offences again thereby leading innocent persons to die. Therefore, it is stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

6. This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties at considerable length.

7. The allegations against the petitioner are that she maintained relationship with the victim Dimple and then started blackmailing him thereby extorting money from him and when he was unable to pay the same, she used to extend threats to him to involve him in cases of rape etc.. She also used to make calls to him repeatedly and mentally torture him. Learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant have shown copy of a memo of recovery of print out of chats that had taken place between the victim and the petitioner. These chats show that on the fateful day, the victim had sent a message to him that she had compelled her to commit suicide. The allegations against the petitioner are quite serious in nature. She has been involved in another case of similar nature. The material witnesses are yet to be examined. The allegations prima facie made out a case for commission of subject offence as against the petitioner. Taking into consideration the nature of the accusations, the quantum of sentence which the conviction may entail and the attendant facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that



the petitioner does not deserve to be released on bail. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

8. It is, however, clarified that the observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial.

9. Since the main petition has already been decided, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

**[MANISHA BATRA]**  
**JUDGE**

**18<sup>th</sup> February, 2026**

*Parveen Sharma*

- |                                      |   |                 |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| <i>1. Whether speaking/ reasoned</i> | : | <i>Yes / No</i> |
| <i>2. Whether reportable</i>         | : | <i>Yes / No</i> |