



CRM-M-60309-2025 (O&M) 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

210

CRM-M-60309-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision:09.12.2025

Amarjeet Kaur

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present: Mr. Jaskaran Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, DAG Haryana

Mr. Nitish, Advocate, for the complainant.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. On 29.10.2025, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel *inter alia* contends that the petitioner is a *bona fide* purchaser for consideration of property vide sale deed No.2588/1 dated 29.05.2019 registered with Sub Registrar, Karnal, which by way of agreement to sell that culminated into an execution of sale deed dated 06.03.2024, Annexure P4, was sold to the complainant and there is a specific recital therein that entire documents of property being sold had been shown to the buyer to his satisfaction and thereafter signatures were appended thereto. A civil suit for recovery of Rs.75,00,000/- even though



CRM-M-60309-2025 (O&M) 2

sale consideration was Rs.45,00,000/- has already been filed by the complainant against the petitioner. Co-accused Ramesh Kumar, has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 25.09.2025, Annexure P6. She is not involved in any other case. She is ready and willing to join the investigation as and when required by the investigating agency and will cooperate.

Notice of motion.

At the asking of the Court, Mr. BS Saroha, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and Mr. Nitish Sharma, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of the complainant.

Learned counsel for the complainant is unable to rebut the aforesaid but for stating that the property shown and sold was different.

Meanwhile, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation on or before 11.11.2025. In the event of her arrest, she shall be released on interim bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer, subject to compliance of conditions as enshrined under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.

However, it is clarified that if the petitioner does not join and cooperate with the Investigating Agency as required by the Arresting/Investigating Officer, this interim order shall be deemed to have been vacated.

Adjourned to 09.12.2025.”

2. Learned counsel submits that in pursuance of the aforementioned order, the petitioner has joined investigation on 03.11.2025 and has fully cooperated with the investigating agency. He further submits that in

CRM-M-60309-2025 (O&M) 3

case the investigating agency requires the petitioner to appear, she shall make herself available without demur.

3. Learned State counsel on instructions affirms the factum of joining the investigation by the petitioner and cooperating with the investigating agency. He also submits that at this stage, the petitioner is not required for further custodial interrogation.

4. In view of the above and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner is allowed and the order dated 29.10.2025 granting interim bail to her, is hereby made absolute, subject to compliance of conditions as specified under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C. (now 482(2) of BNSS, 2023)

5. However, it is made clear that if the petitioner fails to join and cooperate with the investigating agency as and when required, the State would be at liberty to move an application for cancellation of the present anticipatory bail granted to her.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

December 09, 2025
dinesh

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