



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

**CRM-M No.35776 of 2026
Date of decision: 06.07.2026**

Loveleen Popli

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU

Present :- Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate
Mr. Himanshu Chabra, Advocate
Mr. Paras Kukkar, Advocate and
Mr. Jatin, Advocate
for the petitioner.

MANDEEP PANNU, J. (Oral)

1. This is the first petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding Section 438 Cr.P.C.) seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in FIR No.141 dated 09.05.2026, registered under Sections 316(2) and 85 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (corresponding Sections 406 and 498-A IPC) and Sections 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the marriage between the complainant, Divya, and accused No. 1, Loveleen Popli, was solemnized on 19.11.2023 at Sangrur. It is alleged that prior to the marriage, accused No.1 falsely represented himself to be a software developer employed with Amazon having an annual income of about ₹45 lakhs, whereas after the



marriage the complainant allegedly discovered that he was not employed in any multinational company and that the marriage had been solemnized on the basis of fraud and misrepresentation. It is further alleged that after the marriage, accused No.1 induced the complainant to part with money on the pretext of making investments, promotions and other financial needs and thereby obtained approximately ₹41,00,000 from her, which was allegedly misappropriated. It is also alleged that accused No.2, Bharat Bhushan, obtained ₹6,00,000 from the complainant for his firm, accused No.1 borrowed ₹1,60,000 from the complainant's brother and sister-in-law which was never returned, procured a personal loan of about ₹9,00,000 in the complainant's name by misusing her mobile phone and bank account and transferred the amount to his own account and thereafter, to the accounts of accused Nos.4 and 5, besides transferring about ₹8,00,000 from the complainant's credit card to his own account. The complainant has further alleged that she was subjected to mental and physical cruelty, was wrongfully confined for about two months, suffered a miscarriage and was threatened with dire consequences. According to the prosecution, all the accused acted in conspiracy and cheated the complainant of an aggregate amount of approximately ₹82,00,000.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case on the basis of a manipulated and fabricated complaint lodged under the influence of the complainant, who is stated to be related to a serving police official. It is submitted that the marriage between the petitioner and the complainant was solemnized on 19.11.2023 and was a love-cum-arranged marriage, the



relations between the families remained cordial and no demand for dowry was ever raised. It is further contended that the allegations surfaced only in February, 2026 after matrimonial differences arose and that the FIR came to be registered without following the prescribed procedure, as neither the petitioner nor his family members were afforded an opportunity of hearing or counselling before registration of the case. Learned counsel further submits that the complainant has concealed material facts and has levelled false allegations regarding dowry demand, cheating and misappropriation of money. It is also argued that the petitioner was suffering from depression and was under medical treatment, whereas the complainant left the matrimonial home despite medical advice that the petitioner required care and companionship. According to the petitioner, the amount of ₹41,00,000/- allegedly transferred by the complainant was towards household expenses while the parties were residing together at Bengaluru and not as a result of any fraudulent inducement, and the entire prosecution case is a concocted story arising out of a matrimonial dispute.

4. Notice of motion

5. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

6. Mr. Naveen Batra, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of complainant-Divya and has filed *Vakalatnama*, which is taken on the record.

7. Learned State counsel, assisted by learned counsel for the complainant, has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are grave and serious. It is



submitted that the complainant has specifically alleged that the petitioner dishonestly induced her to part with huge amounts of money, including ₹41,00,000/- on the pretext of investment, ₹9,00,000/- by obtaining a personal loan in her name, ₹8,00,000/- from her credit card, ₹6,00,000/- allegedly obtained by co-accused Bharat Bhushan for his firm and ₹1,60,000/- taken from the complainant's brother and sister-in-law, thereby causing an overall loss of approximately ₹82,00,000/-. It is further submitted that though the petitioner was earlier granted interim anticipatory bail and was directed to join the investigation, and he, accordingly, joined the investigation, yet upon considering the material collected during investigation and the serious nature of the allegations, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, dismissed his application for grant of anticipatory bail.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record.

9. The allegations levelled against the petitioner disclose a systematic course of conduct involving cheating, criminal breach of trust and matrimonial cruelty, wherein the complainant alleges that she was induced to part with an amount of approximately ₹82,00,000/-. Significantly, it is not the petitioner's case that the amount of ₹41,00,000/- was never received by him; rather, his stand is that the said amount was spent towards household expenses while the parties were residing together. Whether such an enormous amount could genuinely have been utilized for household expenses is a matter which can only be established during the



course of trial on the basis of cogent evidence.

10. Similarly, the allegations regarding the transfer of ₹9,00,000/- obtained through a personal loan, ₹8,00,000/- transferred from the complainant's credit card, ₹6,00,000/- allegedly obtained by co-accused Bharat Bhushan and ₹1,60,000/- taken from the complainant's brother and sister-in-law constitute serious accusations which cannot be brushed aside at this stage. The fact that the petitioner has joined the investigation pursuant to the interim protection granted by this Court does not, by itself, entitle him to the concession of anticipatory bail.

11. Considering the gravity and seriousness of the allegations, the magnitude of the alleged financial transactions, the nature of the accusations and the material collected during investigation, this Court finds no ground to extend the discretionary relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

12. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed.

13. However, nothing observed herein shall be construed as an expression on the merits of the case.

14. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANDEEP PANNU)
JUDGE

06.07.2026
neetu

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