



CRM-M-54069-2024

-1-

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

210**CRM-M-54069-2024**

Date of Decision:- 13.02.2025

Amarjeet Singh Kapoor

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Thapar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Arshit Goel, Advocate for complainant.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Petitioner Amarjeet Singh Kapoor has filed petition under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in FIR No.0180 dated 02.10.2024, under Sections 354, 323, 341, 596, 34 of IPC registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Patiala, District Patiala (Annexure P-1).

2. As per facts of the case, complainant Sukhpreet Kaur filed written complaint alleging that she along with Amarjeet Singh Kapoor started partnership concern in the name and style of Many Nany International Institute, IELTS, P.T.I (Modaal) Coaching Centre at SCO-17, First Floor, Leela Bhawan, Patiala and one sister concern in the name of



MNNI Immigration Consultant at SCO-157-A, Ground Floor back side Gopal Sweets, Leela Bhawan, Patiala. In both the concerns, they were having equal share. First concern was started in 2018 and the sister concern was started in 2023. After running business for 2-3 years, the complainant notices that Amarjeet Singh Kapoor siphoned out money from the business on one pretext or the other, without her consent. She came to know that he constructed a building for Little Stars Pre & Day Boarding School for his wife and opened another branch of the office at Kharar in the year 2019-20 for his sister Ranjit Kaur Channi without her consent. She raised objection. The dispute started between them. She narrated incident of 20.10.2023 when petitioner raised hand on her. In February, 2024, she was forced to raise a bank loan for sending Preetinder Singh Kapoor (son of the accused) to Canada. She was illtreated on 22.02.2024 and 05.07.2024 as detailed in the FIR. CCTV footage was handed over in a pen drive. After completion of investigation, FIR is registered under Section 354, 323, 341, 506 of IPC.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner argued that petitioner has already joined the investigation. There was interim order in his favour vide order dated 25.11.2024. All allegations levelled against him are false. He had filed complaint to SSP regarding the complainant in FIR which are Annexure P-2 and P-3. Civil litigation is going on. Civil suits filed by both the parties against each other are Annexure P-4 to P-6. In fact the complainant played mischief regarding the admission of his son in Canada. He has already handed over the DVR to the police. Therefore, his anticipatory bail petition may be allowed.



4. Bail petition is opposed by learned counsel representing State as well as learned counsel representing complainant. Status report as well as reply filed. It is pointed out that there are specific serious allegations against the petitioner. There are photographs annexed with the reply (Annexure C-2) clearly showing how present petitioner illtreated and misbehaved with the complainant.

Today, learned counsel representing State pointed out that petitioner has handed over one DVR in which there is recent footage of the office. DVR having recording of the relevant period as detailed in the FIR is not handed over to the police.

5. Learned counsel representing petitioner took the stand that the said DVR was taken away by the complainant herself and thereafter new DVR was installed which is handed over to the investigating agency.

6. I have considered the aforesaid factual position. So far as civil litigation initiated by the petitioner as well as complainant against each other is concerned, the same will be decided on its own merits. In the case in hand, there are allegations against the petitioner supported by still photographs of CCTV footage. It is not disputed that the office premises are in possession of present petitioner. As per learned State counsel, new DVR has been handed over to the police having footage of 21.01.2025 to 06.02.2025 whereas the incidents detailed in the FIR are pertaining to October-2023, February-2024 and July-2024. Petitioner despite having interim relief did not cooperate with the investigating agency. Rather handed over a DVR which has been recently installed. For competition of investigation in this



CRM-M-54069-2024

-4-

case, his custodial interrogation is required. Therefore, interim already granted in favour of petitioner-Amarjeet Singh Kapoor stands vacated and his anticipatory bail petition is accordingly declined.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

13.02.2025

Sunil Devi

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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