

2025:PHHC:135101



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH  
207

CRM-M No.36761 of 2025  
Date of decision: 25.09.2025

Meenakshi Berry ... Petitioner  
  
Vs.  
State of Haryana ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Gourav Jain, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.  
  
Ms. Himani Arora, DAG, Haryana,  
for the respondent-State.

----

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

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                                 |
|---------|------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 256     | 03.08.2022 | Bhuna, District Fatehabad | 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of IPC |

2. Brief facts relevant for the purpose of disposal of the present petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint filed by the complainant Vikas alleging that the accused Krishan, Gurmangat Singh, Satinder Kaur and Babu had allured him on

2025:PHHC:135101



the premise that they could get him appointed in some Government job. On their allurements, the complainant, his brother Dinesh, cousin brothers Vishnu and Sanjay as well as one Pradeep were made to part with a total sum of Rs.30,65,000/- which were given to the accused Krishan, Gurmangat Singh, his wife Satinder Kaur and Babu. These accused along with the petitioner also represented to the victims that their joining letters had been issued by the Army authorities and also showed such letters to them which were subsequently found to be false and fabricated. When the victims demanded their money back, three cheques were issued by the accused persons two of which were dishonoured.

3. The complainant further alleged that on 18.08.2021, the accused Gurmangat Singh called his elder brother Dinesh, his cousin brother Vishnu and himself to Hisar but on reaching there, they were got implicated in a false case registered under Section 365 read with Section 34 of IPC. They were taken into custody and were released on bail. By alleging that the above named accused had committed cheating and forgery with them, the complainant prayed for taking action.

4. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated. Accused Krishan was arrested on 06.01.2025. He suffered disclosure statement. The accused Ritu was arrested on 02.06.2025. She suffered disclosure statement to the effect that the present petitioner who

2025:PHHC:135101



is her sister had introduced her with the co-accused Sandeep, Pardeep, Satinder Kaur, Gurmangat Singh, Ramesh Kumar, Krishan and Rohit Malik. Gurmangat Singh asked her to entrap public persons by giving assurance of getting jobs in the Army and to extort money from them. She further disclosed that on asking of the co-accused, she along with the petitioner and the co-accused had prepared false joining letters purported to be issued by the Army authorities from the laptop of the petitioner. She disclosed that she had received a sum of Rs.2 lakhs in lieu thereof and had given the same to the petitioner and co-accused. The accused Pardeep also suffered disclosure statement to the effect that the petitioner along with the other accused had arranged false medical exams and had prepared false joining letters. The investigation proceedings are still underway. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner moved an application for grant of pre arrest bail which was dismissed by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Fatehabad vide order dated 12.06.2025.

5. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case on the basis of disclosure statement of the co-accused which cannot be considered to be admissible in evidence. She did not play any role in commission of the subject offences. She is ready to join the investigation. Her custodial interrogation is not required. No recovery is to be effected from her. It is, therefore, urged that the

2025:PHHC:135101



petition deserves to be allowed.

6. Status report has been filed. Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana has argued that there are serious and specific allegations against the petitioner who had actively participated in defrauding and cheating the victims including the complainant by arranging for their medical examination purportedly for their recruitment with Army authorities and also got prepared false and fabricated joining letters in the names of the victims qua their joining Army. Her custodial interrogation is must for the purpose of eliciting the entire information as to how the crime was committed, for identification of other potential beneficiaries who swindled money and to trace the money trail. It is, therefore, urged that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

7. This Court has considered the rival submissions.

8. The petitioner in connivance with the co-accused is alleged to have cheated the complainant and other victims by arranging false medical examination to show that the same was got conducted for recruitment in Army and also had actively participated in preparing false joining letters by using their laptops. The allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature. A deeper probe is required to be conducted and, therefore, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is must. In case, the same is denied to the investigation agency, that shall

2025:PHHC:135101



leave many glaring loopholes and gaps, adversely affecting the investigation. The Court has also to see that an order of anticipatory bail should not operate as an inroad in the normal legal procedure of criminal cases by the trial Court. In the present case, no exceptional circumstances warranting exercise of the powers for grant of anticipatory bail by this Court are existing. As such, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition does not deserve to be allowed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

9. It is, however, clarified that observations made hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

25.09.2025  
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether reportable

Yes/No  
Yes/No