

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

Neutral Citation No. **2024:PHHC:050308**  
**CRM-M-59014-2023**  
**Date of Decision: April 15, 2024**

**Amarjit Kaur**

**...Petitioner**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab**

**...Respondent**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA**

**Present:-** Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Pushp Jain, Advocate for the complainant.

**DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)**

By way of present petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C., petitioner prays for grant of pre-arrest bail in a case arising out of FIR No.108 dated 15.09.2023, under Sections 420, 406 and 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Joga, District Mansa, Punjab.

2. FIR was lodged on the complaint of Jasveer Singh, as per which accused Jitender Pal Singh Dhaliwal along with his wife Amarjit Kaur (petitioner), daughter Navjot Kaur and son Gurdeep Singh defrauded him (complainant) for an amount of ₹12 lacs on the pretext of arranging marriage of Navjot Kaur with the complainant by giving false assurance that Navjot Kaur shall be sent abroad for study purpose and later on complainant shall also be sent abroad. However, accused persons failed to get the marriage arranged. On demand, they did not return the money. As per the complainant, it was specific condition of the accused, so as to arrange the money for sending their daughter, i.e. Navjot Kaur to abroad and then they will perform the marriage. Complainant also gave details in the FIR about

the payment of ₹5,50,000/- deposited in the account of Navjot Kaur and to have paid the remaining amount in cash.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that petitioner has been falsely implicated; that no money was received in the account of the petitioner; that petitioner is ready to join investigation and so she be granted the benefit of pre-arrest bail.

4. At the request of counsel for the petitioner, so as to settle the matter through mediation, the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre as counsel for the complainant did not raise any objection in this regard. As such, vide order dated 11.12.2023, it was directed that till the receipt of the report from the Mediation Centre, no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioner.

5. However, it appears that matter was got referred by the petitioner to the Mediation Centre only to get the interim relief as the report of the Mediation Centre would reveal that petitioner did not appear there even once to participate in the mediation proceedings.

6. As contended by learned State counsel, ably supported by counsel for the complainant, there are specific allegations against the petitioner and the co-accused as to how they have cheated the complainant. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner may be required. As such, this Court does not find it a fit case for granting benefit of pre-arrest bail.

Dismissed.

**April 15, 2024**  
sarita

**(DEEPAK GUPTA)**  
**JUDGE**

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