

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

208/3

2023:PHHC:135416

CRM-M-60690-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Promila Rani

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Verma, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Akashdeep Singh, Additional Public Prosecutor,  
U.T. Chandigarh.

Complainant-Vikram Dev Singh Sarang in person  
with Ms. Bindiya Sharma, Advocate.

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)**

Petitioner is seeking grant of the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in FIR No.172 dated 24.11.2022 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 474, 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Central Sector 17, Chandigarh.

2. Vide order dated 12.01.2023, the petitioner had been granted interim anticipatory bail with direction to join investigation and the relevant part of the said order reads as under:-

*“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is only the signatory of the alleged will as well as indemnity bond and is not directly or indirectly beneficiary to the said transaction, if any, as the dispute involved in the present case is intestate in between the family.”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 12.01.2023, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency.

4. Learned counsel for U.T. Chandigarh, on instructions, does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and having cooperated with the investigating agency. It has also been submitted that as per the report received from CFSL, Gujarat, the signatures on the alleged Will were found to be forged. However, learned counsel, on instructions, submits that since all the documents are in the possession of the investigating agency, the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for their custodial interrogation.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant, while opposing the prayer made by the counsel opposite, submits that the petitioner had not approached this Court with clean hands as she had made a false statement that a civil suit was pending between the parties, whereas the fact of the matter was that the civil suit in question already stood dismissed.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner has, however, controverted the submissions made by the learned counsel for the complainant qua the civil suit having been dismissed. It has been submitted that the civil suit between the parties, no doubt, was dismissed but it was dismissed in default, and thereafter, had since been restored, and was now pending for 18.11.2023.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

8. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, more so since the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency, coupled with the fact that the case rests on documentary evidence, the instant petition is allowed and interim

order dated 12.01.2023, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023  
Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No