

2025:PHHC:048027



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.7146 of 2025
Date of Decision: 07.04.2025
Reserved on: 28.03.2025

Synthia Sangra @ Sinthiya Sangra ... Petitioner

Versus
State of Punjab ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab,
for the respondent-State.

Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate,
for the complainant.

MANISHA BATRA, J.

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (For short “BNSS”) seeking anticipatory bail in the FIR mentioned below:-

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
133	25.11.2024	Division 7, District Police Commissionerate Jalandhar	420 and 120-B of IPC

2. As per the allegations, the accused Monik Sohal was acquainted with the complainant Jeevan Singh and had introduced him with the accused Parvinder Kumar Sangra and the petitioner who is wife of Parvinder Kumar Sangra, both of whom induced the complainant to

2025:PHHC:048027



purchase a plot from them for a sum of Rs.40 lakhs. A written agreement to sell was executed. The complainant paid an amount of Rs.10 lakhs to the petitioner and the co-accused but subsequently came to know that the said plot had already been sold to one Manjit Kaur who further sold it to Iqbal Kaur and then it was purchased by one Parminder Ghotra. The petitioner and the co-accused returned only of sum of Rs.1.50 lakhs to him out of the earnest money amount but did not pay the rest of the same thereby causing wrongful loss to him. On the basis of these allegations, the aforementioned FIR was registered. Investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre arrest bail which has been dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide order dated 20.01.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. A complaint was previously filed by the complainant. Inquiry was conducted by officer of the rank of Assistant Deputy Commissioner and a cancellation report was prepared. She was exonerated. Infact, the husband of the petitioner had taken a friendly loan from the complainant and as security, four cheques were given. The complainant procured signatures of her husband and herself on several blank documents and misused the same by converting them into sale agreement. Out of the borrowed amount, an amount of Rs.2.5 lakhs has been transferred in the bank account of the complainant through RTGS and another amount of Rs.2 lakhs has been given in cash. The petitioner and her husband are

2025:PHHC:048027



ready to repay the remaining loan amount to the complainant. She is ready to join the investigation. Her custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from her. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has already been filed. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has argued that the petitioner and her husband duped the complainant of a sum of Rs.10 lakhs on the pretext of entering into agreement to sell some property which had already been sold by the petitioner to some other persons. Her custodial interrogation is required for conducting thorough investigation in the matter. No extraordinary and sparing circumstance for grant of bail has been made out. Therefore, it is argued that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

6. It will be relevant to mention that the matter had been sent to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court but has not been settled. The petitioner along with her husband is alleged to have duped the complainant of a sum of Rs.10 lakhs on the pretext of entering into agreement to sell some property which is alleged to have already been sold by her. It is a case of version and cross version since according to the petitioner, her husband had borrowed an amount of Rs.10 lakhs from complainant and the documents got signed by him were converted into agreement to sell. An amount of Rs.1.50 lakhs has been returned by the

2025:PHHC:048027



petitioner/her husband to the complainant. The dispute between the parties appear to be of civil nature. Her custodial interrogation, as such, is not required. No material has been placed on record to show that the petitioner has executed any agreement in writing in favour of the complainant. Given the nature of the allegations, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre trial incarceration is not required. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of her arrest, on the following conditions:-

- (i) She shall furnish requisite personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting officer/investigating officer by surrendering before him within a period of ten days and shall join investigation.
- (ii) She shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when called subsequently and submit all documents and details as may be called upon by him.
- (iii) She shall not tamper with the evidence or cause any threat or to any of the prosecution witnesses in any manner.
- (iv) In the event of violation of any of the abovesaid terms, her bail shall stand automatically cancelled.
- (v) She shall not leave the country without prior permission of the trial Court.
- (vi) She shall regularly appear before the Court on every date



of hearing and also and when called upon to do so during the course of trial.

7. It is further clarified that the observations made above are only for the purpose of consideration of application for anticipatory bail and the same shall not in any manner influence the trial. The trial Court shall consider the case on its merits and without being influenced by this order.

07.04.2025
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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