



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

101

CRM-M-26908-2025

Date of decision: July 16th, 2025

Shalika Wadhwa

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of UT Chandigarh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Prateek Rathee, Additional Public Prosecutor,
U.T. Chandigarh.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (ORAL)

Petitioner, through the instant petition (second), is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail in FIR No.66 dated 13.04.2024 under Sections 420, 120-B of the IPC registered at Police Station Central Sector-17, Chandigarh.

2. Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate and Mr. H.S. Jugait, Advocate have entered appearance on behalf of the complainant and filed their separate power of attorneys, which are taken on record.

3. At the outset, learned standing counsel for UT assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the prayer made for extending the concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. It has been submitted that firstly, there is not change in circumstances much less material after the previous petition was disposed of in the following terms:

"1. After arguing for some time, when this Court was not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner in view of the fact that there had been continuous non-

compliance of the undertaking given to this Court on the previous dates of hearing and coupled with the fact that the learned counsel could not refute the submissions made by the learned Standing counsel for U.T., Chandigarh that a Look Out Circular had also been issued against the petitioner and she was caught just in the nick of time while she was going to cross into Nepal, a prayer was made by learned counsel for the petitioner for withdrawal of the instant petition at this stage.

2. *Dismissed as withdrawn.”*

4. It has been further submitted by the counsel for the respondent, on instructions, that there are 14 other persons, who have been duped by the petitioner for a sum exceeding ₹1 crore. It has also been submitted that in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is every likelihood that she could flee the country as she is already on regular bail in the other nine cases. A prayer has, therefore, been made for dismissal of the instant petition as the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessitated in the present case.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material on record.

6. In the facts and circumstances as enumerated hereinabove, this Court is not inclined to extend the extraordinary concession of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant petition stands dismissed.

8. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed to be an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

July 16th, 2025

Puneet

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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