



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

276

CRM-M-38865-2025 (O&M)

Date of decision: 29.09.2025

MANDEEP KAUR

...PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Deepanshu Grover, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Gurcharan S. Rai, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. A.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the complainant.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No. 110 dated 03.05.2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 of IPC at Police Station Tripuri, Patiala.

2. On 22.07.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Instant petition is preferred under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short ‘BNSS’) seeking anticipatory bail in FIR No.110 dated 03.05.2025 under Sections 406 & 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Tripuri, Patiala.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, inter alia, contends that the petitioner has delivered a child day before yesterday. The allegations against her are too far-fetched. It is not believable that against pledging a gold kara (bracelet), an amount of Rs.2.70 lakhs can be extended as loan. Further, the dispute between the parties at the most could be civil in nature and factual ingredients to cheat from the very inception are clearly missing. The petitioner is having clean antecedents and she is not involved in any other case.



Notice of motion.

Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl. A.G., Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Anureet Singh Sidhu, Advocate, assisted by Ms. Chandanpreet Kaur Ahluwalia, Advocate appears on behalf of the complainant and files Memorandum of Appearance in the Court today, which is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place of the case file.

Learned counsel for the complainant opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that during the mediation proceedings before learned Sessions Court, the petitioner has backed out from the compromise. Adjourned to 22.08.2025.

Keeping in view the ratio of law enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI (2022) 10 SCC 51; Siddharam Satlingappa Mhetre Vs. State of Maharashtra and others 2010 SCC OnLine SC 137; Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia etc. Vs. State of Punjab (1980) 2 SCC 565, Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (2014) 8 SCC 273 and Sushila Aggarwal Vs. State of NCT Delhi 2020 (1) RCR (Criminal) 833, the petitioner is directed to appear before Investigating Officer within a period of two weeks from today and thereafter, as directed by the Investigating Officer. In the event of arrest, the petitioner will be admitted to interim anticipatory bail on furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Investigating/Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation/Arresting Officer and abide by the conditions as provided under Section 482(2) of BNSS (erstwhile Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973).

If the Arresting Officer does not permit the petitioner to join the investigation, she would appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate, who would then summon the Arresting Officer and direct him to join the petitioner in the investigation, in terms of the order of this Court.

Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an expression of opinion by this Court and learned trial Court shall decide the case on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law."

3. The mediation proceedings, earlier initiated between the parties have not fructified.



4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has stated that pursuant to the order dated 22.07.2025 the petitioner has joined investigation and is no longer required for custodial interrogation.

5. Learned counsel for the complainant has vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner by arguing that the allegations raised against the petitioner are direct/serious in nature and hence she ought not to be extended the concession of anticipatory bail. She has further iterated that in case the petitioner is extended the concession of anticipatory bail, there is all the likelihood that she may interfere with the investigation as also intimidate the investigation/witnesses.

6. Keeping in view the factual milieu of the case in hand; especially the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated therein and is no longer required by the State for further custodial interrogation, this Court is inclined to confirm the order dated 22.07.2025 granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the conditions as enumerated under Section 482(2) of BNSS.

7. Ordered accordingly.

8. This order should not be treated as “blanket” order. It will not be read granting petitioner indefinite protection from arrest. It shall be confined to the FIR mentioned *ibid* and will not operate in respect of any other incident that involves commission of an offence.

9. Liberty is reserved in favour of State/complainant to move for cancellation/recall of this order in case the petitioner violates any condition stipulated under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 or upon showing any other sufficient cause.

10. Needless to say that anything observed herein above shall not be construed to be an opinion on the merits of the case.
11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)

JUDGE

29.09.2025

jatin

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