



CRM-M-17402-2025
CRM-M-20711-2025

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

Decided on: 12.11.2025

CRM-M-17402-2025

Usha Devi Petitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CRM-M-20711-2025

Shruti Petitioner

Versus

State of PunjabRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Dr. Sumati Jund, Advocate with
Mr. Rahul Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. G.S.Brar, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

This order will dispose of above-said petitions as both of them have arisen out of same FIR. Brief facts of case are taken from CRM-M-17402-2025.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier treated as Section 438 Cr.PC, 1973) praying for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.48 dated 04.03.2025 registered under Sections 306 and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (Section 317(2) of BNS, 2023 was added later on) at Police Station Rama Mandi, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar, Punjab.



2. On 08.05.2025, this Court passed the following order:

“The petitioners seek grant of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 in case bearing FIR No.48 dated 04.03.2025 registered under Sections 306 & 3(5) of BNS, 2023 (Section 317(2) of BNS, 2023 added later on) at Police Station Rama Mandi, Police Commissionerate Jalandhar, Punjab.

The learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the allegations against the petitioners and their co-accused Ganga Parshad, who happens to be the husband of petitioner-Usha and the father of Shruti is that all of them siphoned off money from the dairy farm of the complainant. He contends that Ganga Parshad has already been granted the concession of regular bail vide order dated 13.03.2025 (Annexure P-3).

Adjourned to 03.07.2025.

In the meantime, the petitioners are directed to appear before the SHO/Investigating Officer to join investigation and in the event of their arrest, they shall be released on bail on their furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of SHO/Investigating Agency subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) BNSS:-

- i) that the petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation before the Investigating Officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;*
- iii) that the petitioner shall not leave the country,*



without prior permission of the Court and shall surrender his/her/their passport, if any.

Meanwhile, the State counsel is directed to file an affidavit as to the exact role of the petitioners along with the details of pending FIRs, if any, on or before the next date of hearing.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the other connected matter.”

3. Thereafter, interim order was continued on the previous two dates.

4. Continuing his submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners contends that in compliance of the order dated 08.05.2025, passed by this Court, petitioners have joined the investigation, and have fully co-operated. Therefore, she prays for confirmation of the said interim anticipatory bail order.

5. Learned State counsel on instructions confirms the said averment made by counsel for the petitioners of joining the investigation on 19.06.2025 by the petitioners, and submits that as of now, none of the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the complainant submits that after granting of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, Ravi Kumar and Arvind both sons of Usha Devi have threatened members of the complainant party and in that regard, separate FIR bearing No.163 dated 06.06.2025 under Sections 115(2), 118, 126(2), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 (118(2) of BNS added later on) at Police Station Rama Mandi District Jalandhar has been registered against them.



CRM-M-17402-2025
CRM-M-20711-2025

4

The said aspect has also been mentioned in para 11 of the status report filed by the State counsel. Status report filed by the State is taken on record subject to just exceptions.

7. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and noticing the order dated 08.05.2025 vide which petitioners were directed to join investigation.

8. However, said part is yet to be ascertained by the concerned Court while dealing with the subsequently registered case wherein allegations are there against other co-accused. Therefore, it is not proper and appreciable to take note of the said aspect for the purpose of declining the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, especially when State does not warrant the custody of the petitioners for any interrogation purpose; ad-interim bail order dated 08.05.2025, passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition(s) is allowed.

However, petitioners shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

12.11.2025
sonia

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/~~NO~~
Whether Reportable: ~~YES~~/NO