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

CRM-M-36914-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22nd July, 2025

Amandeep Kaur

… Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

… Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Arshpreet Khadial, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Deol, Sr. Dy. Advocate General, Punjab
for the respondent/State.

<u>MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.</u>

1. The petitioner, a serving police official holding the rank of Senior Lady Constable, seeks the grant of regular bail under Section 483 of BNSS in case FIR No.15 dated 26.05.2025 under Section 13(1)B read with Section 13(2) of Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018 registered at Police Station Vigilance Bureau, Bathinda, District Bathinda, wherein allegations have been levelled against her of acquisition of assets disproportionate to her known sources of income during the check period from 01.04.2018 to 31.03.2025.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and that the period chosen for evaluating the alleged disproportion is arbitrary and biased, especially considering that the petitioner joined the police force in 2011. It is argued that the Investigating Agency has deliberately omitted certain

legitimate sources of income, including loans taken and alimony received pursuant to a judicial order, which, if taken into account, would explain the excess expenditure attributed to the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel has still further submitted that the petitioner has an established social media presence, with a substantial following, and has generated income through brand endorsements and related digital activity – an aspect that, according to him, the Investigating Agency has completely disregarded. It is asserted that the petitioner has maintained a clean and impeccable service record and has conducted herself with transparency throughout her service. It has also been submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 26.05.2025, the investigation is complete, and the final report has already been presented. Therefore, the petitioner deserves to be released on regular bail.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer and submissions made by the counsel opposite, has drawn attention of this Court to the gravity and specificity of the allegations. It is submitted, on instructions, that the financial analysis conducted during the course of investigation reveals that the petitioner is in possession of movable and immovable assets amounting to ₹31,27,252.97 including her exorbitant expenditure, which constitutes approximately 28.5% excess over her known sources of income. It has been further contended that upon deeper scrutiny, including analysis of movable and immovable assets acquired by the petitioner, the excess was found to be of an aggravated nature – amounting to ₹48,06,412.00, that is approximately 44.34% beyond her known sources of income. It has also been submitted by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that even though challan has been presented, a supplementary charge-sheet is in the process of

being presented in light of the above findings, as some more incriminating material has come to light.

5. Still further, it has been pointed out by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that the petitioner is involved in two other criminal cases, including one under the IPC and another under the NDPS Act. Importantly, it has been submitted by the learned State counsel, on instructions, that the involvement of the petitioner in the instant case allegedly came to light during investigation in the NDPS case. In these circumstances, the learned State counsel has emphasized that the instant petition be dismissed as her further custodial interrogation is required for facilitating inquiry and recovery of certain records that may be crucial for still further effective investigation.

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

7. Prima facie, the allegations against the petitioner are grave and attract serious concern, particularly in light of the position of public trust held by her as a serving police official. The material placed before this Court, including the financial analysis chart submitted with the FIR, reveals a substantial and prima facie unjustified increase in wealth during the check period. The contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner regarding arbitrary selection of the check period is not persuasive in the present context, especially when viewed in light of the overall financial inflow and also the alleged involvement of the petitioner in two other criminal cases, including a case under the NDPS Act.

8. The explanation offered by the learned counsel for the petitioner with respect to alleged alternative sources of income – such as

brand endorsements or social media monetization – has neither been substantiated on record nor has the learned counsel placed on record any credible trail demonstrating lawful and declared generation of income.

9. This Court also cannot lose sight of the fact that further investigation is underway, and a supplementary charge-sheet is proposed to be filed on the basis of additional material discovered during the investigation. The nature of the allegations, the magnitude of the disproportion, the possibility of further recovery and scrutiny, and the involvement of the petitioner in other criminal cases necessitate a thorough investigation that would be hampered if the petitioner is released on bail at this stage.

10. In view of the foregoing, and considering the serious nature of allegations, no case is made out for grant of regular bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the petition stands dismissed. 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.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

July 22, 2025
rps

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