



216 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-52549-2025

Date of Decision: 17.11.2025

LAKSHMI DEVI

..... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Girdhari Shanker Verma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rahul Jindal, AAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Malkit Singh.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.191 dated 31.07.2025, registered under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) & 351(2) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Division No.7, District Ludhiana, Punjab.

2. On 17.09.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Prayer in this petition under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.191 dated 31.07.2025, registered under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) & 351(2) of BNS, 2023 at Police Station Division No.7, District Ludhiana, Punjab.

Notice of motion. Mr. G.S. Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. Both the parties have been heard and material collected by the police during investigation has been perused.

The present case has been registered on the basis of complaint given to the police by Seema daughter of late Vijay Kumar with the allegations that her father owned 50 square yards house out of total area of 100 square yards,



who has died on 23.05.2024. After his death, she is his only legal heir. She was residing at Srinagar and working there while her father was living in Ludhiana at the time of his death. During his lifetime, he had met one Pramod Kumar, who along with his wife Lakshmi Devi allured him and they started living together and they committed fraud with her father. Lakshmi Devi had developed an illicit relationship with her father Vijay Kumar while her husband was also living in the same house along with five sons of Lakshmi Devi. When she came to Ludhiana after the death of her father, she came to know that Lakshmi Devi and her husband have got the property transferred in their favour by preparing some forged documents and she sought action against her.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that Vijay Kumar was earlier married to Asha Rani and they had one daughter namely Seema Rani-complainant and one son. However, in a Panchayat, they mutually divorced each other and started living separately vide Panchayati Compromise deed Annexure P-5. Petitioner has been residing with said Vijay Kumar for the last 24 years and one son Anil Kumar was also born out of their relationship. Learned Counsel has placed on file the PAN Card and Aadhar Card of Anil Kumar, which reflect that his father's name is Vijay Kumar. Learned counsel next contended that no documents have been forged and that the property was transferred by Vijay Kumar out of his own free will and rather, he had disowned the complainant during his lifetime. Learned counsel contended that petitioner is ready to join the investigation and to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by the Court and benefit of anticipatory bail be extended in her favour.

On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential to elicit the modus operandi adopted by the petitioner in committing the crime and in view of the gravity of offence, she does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

Adjourned to 17.11.2025 for filing status report. Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation and in the event of her arrest, she shall be admitted to ad-interim bail on furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the following conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the BNSS [erstwhile Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.]:-

- i) that the petitioner shall make herself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;*
- ii) that the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person*



acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
iii) that the petitioner shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court;
iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.

3. Today, learned State counsel has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 17.09.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.
4. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 17.09.2025, whereby the petitioner was granted interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. However, she shall continue to join investigation, if and so required by the Investigating Officer.
5. Disposed of.
6. Pending misc application (s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

17.11.2025
Priyanka Thakur

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No