



210

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

**CRM-M-1235-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision : 25.02.2025**

Hardeep Kaur Dhillon

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU**

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Sheoran, DAG, Haryana.

**MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.**

Petition under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (*for short, 'the B.N.S.S.'*) has been filed for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.337 dated 24.07.2024, under Sections 120-B, 201, 406 and 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC'), registered at Police Station Bhiwani City, District Biwani, Haryana.

(2) Learned State counsel, on instructions from Inspector Devender Singh, submits that petitioner was granted interim bail by this Court, vide order dated 14.01.2025 and she has already joined the investigation; but he opposed the prayer on the premise that recovery of Rs.6 Lakh is yet to be effected.

(3) Heard learned State Counsel and perused the paper-book.



(4) Petitioner was granted interim bail by this Court, vide order dated 14.01.2025 and the order reads as under:-

*“Contends, inter alia, that both the main accused, namely, Abhishek & Sandeep are still at run and petitioner, being employee of aforesaid Sandeep, is unnecessarily being harassed by the police.*

*Notice of motion.*

*Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, learned AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State; seeks time to have instructions and/or to file written response in the matter.*

*Posted for 25.02.2025.*

*In the meanwhile, petitioner shall join investigation before the Investigating Officer. In the event of her arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit her to interim bail, till the next date of hearing, on furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioner shall also abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 482 (2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.”*

(5) It is duly acknowledged by learned State Counsel that in pursuance of the aforesaid order, petitioner has joined investigation. The objection raised by learned State Counsel to the effect that recovery of money is yet to be effected would not be a ground to deny pre-arrest bail to the petitioner for the reason that police is not to act as recovery agents of the complainant.

(6) In view of the above, there is no justification to deny the concession of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. Consequently, present petition is allowed; interim order dated 14.01.2025 is made absolute subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS.



(7) It is also made clear that petitioner shall fully co-operate with the Investigating Officer as and when called for further investigation.

(8) The above observations be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of the case; rather confined only to decide the bail matter.

(9) It is also clarified that in case of any recurrence on the part of petitioner, State would be at liberty to move an appropriate application for recalling of this order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

25.02.2025

*d.gulati*

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)  
JUDGE

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