

Sanju alias Anju Vs. State (1)

IN THE COURT OF SHRI MANJINDER SINGH,
SESSIONS JUDGE, MANSA
(UID NO.PB0064)

PBMN010007672026



BA/279/2026

Presented on : 12-02-2026

Registered on : 12-02-2026

Decided on : 17.02.2026

Sanju alias Anju, aged about 31 years, wife of Raja alias Raja Lahoria,
resident of Ward No.11, Budhlada, Tehsil Budhlada, District Mansa, now
resident of Gali No.2, K.P. Nagar, Jallowala Abadi, Jalandhar.

--- Applicant-accused

Versus

State of Punjab

--Respondent

Bail application under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik
Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

FIR No.196 dated 14.10.2025,
under Sections 333, 190, 191(2), 329(2) of the
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) 2023, Police
Station, City Budhlada, District Mansa.

Present: Shri Harbans Singh Chauhan, Advocate, counsel for
applicant-accused.

Shri Husan Bansal, Public Prosecutor for the State.

(Manjinder Singh)
Sessions Judge, Mansa
17.02.2026

ORDER

This order will dispose of bail application filed by applicant/accused Sanju alias Anju under Section 482 BNSS for releasing her on anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.196 dated 14.10.2025, under Sections 333, 190, 191(2), 329(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) 2023, Police Station, City Budhlada, District Mansa.

2. Upon notice, this application was contested by learned Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned Public Prosecutor for the State and have gone through the file very carefully with their able assistance.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant/accused has argued that the applicant/accused is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. The applicant/accused has not committed any offence and even she was not present at the spot of alleged occurrence. Actually, in the morning of 14.10.2025, complainant Shami Kumar along with others inflicted injuries on the person of Ginni, Reena and Subash, and due to which, they were admitted in Civil Hospital, Budhlada, from where they were referred to Civil Hospital, Mansa due to their serious injuries. The statement of the Subash Ram, brother of the applicant, was also recorded by the police on 16.10.2025. Subash Ram was discharged from the hospital on 23.10.2025; Ginni on 17.10.2025 and a Reena was discharged from the hospital on 18.10.2025. But, the police in connivance with the

(Manjinder Singh)
Sessions Judge, Mansa
17.02.2026

complainant registered this false case against the applicant and others. Nothing is to be recovered from the applicant/ accused and as such, she is not required for any custodial interrogation. The applicant/accused is ready to join the investigation. Police of Police Station, City Budhlada is raiding the house of the accused time and again to arrest her in the present case. No useful purpose will be served by sending the accused behind the bars. Therefore, she may kindly be released on anticipatory bail.

5. On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor for the State that offence attributed to accused/applicant is very serious in nature and no leniency is required in such like matters. Anticipatory bail applications of co-accused Shakina etc. and Subash etc. have already been dismissed by this Court vide orders dated 23.10.2025 and 31.10.2025. Hence, prayed for dismissal of the bail application.

6. From perusal of the police file, this Court finds that this case was registered on the statement of complainant Shami Kumar son of Darshan Kumar. In his statement, he has stated that he is a scrap dealer at Budhlada. On 14.10.2025, at about 6:00 p.m. he along with his mother Nisha Rani wife of Darshan Kumar along with their family were present at home. At that time, he heard a noise outside his house and some persons were abusing him by name. When he came out, he found that Subash son of Om Parkash armed with Dang, Omi son of Kheta Ram armed with Gandasa, Sanju wife of Raja armed with brick bat and glass bottle, Ali son of Vicky armed with Dang, Maheer son of Vicky armed

(Manjinder Singh)
Sessions Judge, Mansa
17.02.2026

with Dang, Shakina alias Bheema wife of Vicky armed with brick bat, Shanti wife of Omi armed with brick bat, Sewak son of Sattu armed with Dang, Ginni wife of Sewak armed with brick bat, residents of Ward No.11, Budhlada, Ajay Kumar son of Omi armed with Gandasa, Sikander son of Charna armed with Gandasa, Ravi son of Charna armed with baseball, Suresh son of Charna armed with Gandasa, residents of near Bus Stand, Ratia, Shinda son of Seeta Ram, resident of Mansa armed with Gandasa, Sonu son of Raju armed with Dang, Sunil son of Raju armed with Gandasa, residents of Jakhal, Raja son of unknown armed with Gandasa, resident of near Balmiki Chowk, Jalandhar, Reena wife of Vijay armed with brick bat and glass bottle, with an intention to kill him, trespassed into his house. Due to their fear, all his family members entered their rooms and these persons started throwing brick bats and glass bottles towards them. They saved their life by remaining present in their rooms. On the spot, Ajay Kumar was alleging that in the morning itself, as there was dispute of children and complainant party had not listened to them and due to which, they had beaten Jyoti Rani wife of Thakur, Sunil son of Raj Kumar, Kali son of Vijay and they are admitted in Government Hospital, Budhlada. Now the complainant party will not be spared. Thereafter, all the above-said accused started raising Lalkaras and started damaging the other household articles lying in the house. He along with his other family members raised raula and at this, neighbours gathered at the spot and upon this, all the accused ran away from the spot

(Manjinder Singh)
Sessions Judge, Mansa
17.02.2026

with their respective weapons. The above-said persons by committing trespass into their house with intention to kill them, damaged the household articles. On the basis of this statement, the present FIR was registered under Sections 333, 190, 191(2), 329(2) of BNS against the accused/applicant and others. The offence attributed to the accused/applicant is very serious in nature and the accused/applicant being members of an unlawful assembly armed with deadly weapons, committed the offence of rioting by trespassing into house of complainant and also damaging the household articles lying there. The number of accused armed with deadly weapons clearly shows that they have entered into the house of complainant with an intention to eliminate him. The weapons of assault are yet to be recovered and as such, accused/applicant are required for custodial interrogation. Taking into note the totality of the facts, no leniency is required in such like matters. In **Bal Krishan Fauzdar VS. State of Haryana 2018 (1) RCR Criminal 789**, it is held by Hon'ble High Court in para No. 8 that, "it is well settled that custodial interrogation is more elicitation oriented since a person, who is couched in comparative safety of pre-arrest bail would certainly not disclose all the facts within his knowledge which would be inculpatory for him. In case custodial interrogation of the petitioner is denied to the investigating agency that would leave many loose ends and gaps in the investigation affecting the investigation being carried out adversely, which is not called for. Same view was taken by the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Bharat**

(Manjinder Singh)
Sessions Judge, Mansa
17.02.2026

Chaudhari & others Vs. State of Bihar & Anr. 2003(4) RCR (Criminal) 716 (Supreme Court). The gravity of the offence is an important factor to be taken into consideration while granting anticipatory bail so also the need for custodial interrogation. The law laid down in these citations is fully applicable to the facts of the case in hand. No exceptional ground is made out to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the accused/applicant. Anticipatory bail application of co-accused Shakina etc. and Subash etc. have already been dismissed by this Court vide orders dated 23.10.2025 and 31.10.2025. As such, keeping in view the gravity of offence, I do not deem it fit case to grant concession of anticipatory bail to the accused/ applicant and the anticipatory bail application filed by accused/applicant is hereby dismissed being devoid of any merits. File be consigned to the record room. Police record be returned immediately.

Pronounced in open Court.

17.02.2026

(Manjinder Singh)
Sessions Judge, Mansa
(UID No.PB0064)

Sukhwinder Singh SG-II
(Directly dictated on computer)

(Manjinder Singh)
Sessions Judge, Mansa
17.02.2026

CNR No.PBMN010007672026

BA/279/2026

Sanju alias Anju Vs. State

Present: Shri Harbans Singh Chauhan, Advocate, counsel for
applicant-accused.
Shri Husan Bansal, Public Prosecutor for the State.

In pursuance of notice, learned Public Prosecutor has put in
appearance for the respondent/State. Police record produced. Arguments
heard. Vide separate detailed order of even date the bail application has
been dismissed. Police record be returned immediately. Bail application
file be consigned to record room.

Pronounced in open Court.
17.02.2026

(Manjinder Singh)
Sessions Judge, Mansa
(UID No.PB0064)

Sukhwinder Singh SG-II