



CRM-M-51690-2024

1

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

208

CRM-M-51690-2024

Date of Decision : December 04, 2024

SONALI

-PETITIONER

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB

-RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mrs. Kanwal S. Walia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, A.A.G., Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, as instituted under Section 482 of the B.N.S.S., 2023, the petitioner seeks the concession of anticipatory bail, in FIR No.118 dated 12.09.2024, under Sections 409 and 420 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Sadar Patiala.

2. On 18.11.2024, this Court had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant petition:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner has vociferously refuted the allegations, as mentioned in the status report dated 27.10.2024, whereby it is alleged that total embezzled amount is Rs.25,70,444/-, whereas she submits that the total amount, which infact is in dispute is Rs.11,73,800/-. She further submits that there is nothing with the prosecution agency to submit that she has infact embezzled the amount more than Rs.11,73,800/-.

The State is directed to file additional affidavit, disclosing therein, the incriminating material and the supporting substance to submit that the embezzled amount is Rs.25,70,444/-.

Adjourned to 4.12.2024.

In the meanwhile, in the event of arrest, the petitioner shall be released on interim bail subject to her furnishing personal and surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating



CRM-M-51690-2024

2

Officer. The petitioner shall, however, join the investigation as and when called for and shall also abide by the conditions specified under Section 482(2) of the BNS.”

3. Today, the learned State counsel has filed the additional affidavit of Rajesh Kumar Chhiber, PPS, Superintendent of Police, Rural, District Patiala, which is taken on record. Moreover, on instructions imparted to her by A.S.I. Davinder Singh, the learned State counsel has stated that pursuant to the making of the hereinabove reproduced order, the petitioner had joined investigation and she is no longer required for further custodial interrogation.

4. In view of the above, the hereinabove reproduced interim order dated 18.11.2024, as made by this Court, is hereby made **absolute**, subject to the hereinafter extracted conditions:-

“(i) the petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the present offence;

(ii) the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case;

(iii) the petitioner shall make herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required.”

5. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

6. Needless to say that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.

December 04, 2024
devinder

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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