



216

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRM-M-60629-2025****Date of decision: 18.12.2025**

GURPREET KAUR

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: None.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (Oral)

1. Today, lawyers are abstaining from work.
2. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.194, dated 15.08.2025, under Sections 318(4), 61(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.
3. On 03.11.2025, following order was passed:-

“1. Prayer in this petition under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 is for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No.194, dated 15.08.2025, under Sections 318(4), 61(2) of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Sadar Tarn Taran, District Tarn Taran.

2. Notice of motion.

3. Mr. Jatinder Pal Singh, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State. The parties have been heard and material on file has been perused.

4. As per allegations in the FIR, Sikandar Singh and one Balwinder Kaur, agreed to sell 35 kanal 06 marla land in favour of complainant-Baljit Kaur at the rate of Rs.27 lakh per acre, vide agreement dated 31.12.2024. Complainant issued 06 cheques of Rs.5 lakhs each, amounting to Rs.30 lakhs in favour of both the sellers. Three cheques given to Sikander Singh were not encashed and were not cleared by the bank, while three cheques given to Balwinder Kaur were encashed. Subsequently, complainant transferred a sum of Rs.10 lakhs



through RTGS in the account of Sikander Singh on 04.01.2025 and on the same day, she transferred Rs.5 lakhs, through RTGS in the account of Gurpreet Kaur (petitioner), who is a cousin of Sikander Singh. The sale deed was to be executed on or before 25.08.2025 and possession was to be delivered on 01.05.2025, which was not delivered. Later on, complainant came to know that Sikander Singh in connivance with other persons had executed a registered deed dated 22.05.2025, qua his share in the said land in favour of Gurudwara Sukhsagar Sahib, in order to deprive the complainant of her legal right. He has neither returned the amount, nor sold the land and complainant has been cheated.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that petitioner has been falsely implicated. Agreement to sell was executed by Sikander Singh, who is a cousin of the petitioner and when the cheques given to Sikander Singh were dishonored, complainant had paid Rs.10 lakhs to Sikander Singh and on the asking of Sikander Singh, she had transferred Rs.5 lakhs in the account of petitioner. No inducement was caused by the petitioner, so as to cheat the complainant in any manner. In case Sikander Singh has failed to honour the agreement and to execute the sale deed, the remedy with the complainant is to sue him for specific performance of the agreement and no act of criminality is involved. Learned counsel next 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 favour of the petitioner.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel has opposed the bail and argued that petitioner has committed a heinous offence and she has cheated the complainant of Rs.5 lakhs in conspiracy with Sikander Singh, who has not executed the sale deed in respect of the land agreed to be sold and has rather, transferred the land to Gurudwara Sukhsagar Sahib. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is essential and she does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

*7. Adjourned to **18.12.2025** 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 subsection (3) of Section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.”

4. Today, ASI Gurpreet has informed this Court that the petitioner has joined the investigation, in compliance of the order dated 03.11.2025 and is no longer required for further investigation.
5. In view of the aforesaid, the order dated 03.11.2025, 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.
6. Disposed of.
7. Pending misc application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

18.12.2025
Priyanka Thakur

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

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