



209

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-65592-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.02.2025

Shweta Chawla
State of Haryana

Versus

...Petitioner
...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Chander Shekhar, Advocate, with
Mr. Manmohan Saroop, Advocate and
Mr. Sudhanshu Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Shandilya, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ashwani Verma, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

The petitioner is seeking the concession of anticipatory bail under Section 482 of the BNSS in case FIR No. 0067 dated 23.03.2024 under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City Ratia, District Fatehabad

2. On the last date of hearing/on 01.01.2025, while noticing the following submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had granted the concession of interim bail to the petitioner and asked her to join investigation:-

“Inter-alia contends that the petitioner is a lady aged about 39



years, the FIR in question was registered on 23.03.2024 and the petitioner was cooperating with the investigating agency; the need to file the plea for anticipatory bail arose in December, 2024 & the petitioner is willing to join investigation and cooperate therein.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance of order dated 01.01.2025, the petitioner has joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. It has further been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the only role attributed to the petitioner having introduced the complainant with co-accused Kulwinder Kaur, who was then to arrange for the complainant's visa for going to Canada. Learned counsel submits that although an amount of Rs. Ten lakhs was transferred into the account of the petitioner, however, it is also a matter of record that the said amount has since been returned to the complainant. The remaining amount of Rs. 26.50 lakhs was never deposited into the account of the petitioner but had been given to the co-accused.

4. Learned State counsel, on instructions, has not disputed the submissions made by the counsel opposite that there has been compliance of order dated 01.01.2025. It has also not been disputed that an amount of Rs. 26.50 Lakhs had not been given to the petitioner but to the co-accused. He also does not dispute the factum of the petitioner having joined investigation and cooperated with the investigating agency. He, on further instructions, submits that the petitioner is not required for further investigation much less for his custodial interrogation.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the complainant has,



however, opposed the prayer and submissions made by counsel for the petitioner and has submitted that the petitioner's connivance with the co-accused was writ large as it was him, who had introduced the complainant to the co-accused after giving an assurance that the co-accused would help in procuring work permit for Canada.

6. In view of the above, the petition is allowed and interim order dated 01.01.2025, is made absolute subject to the conditions laid down in 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

27.02.2025

Satyawan

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

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