



264 (2 cases)

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

Date of Decision:- 29.04.2026

(1)

CRM-M-591-2026

Monika Parti

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

....Respondent

(2)

CRM-M-2545-2026

Nitin Parti

....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI

Present:- Mr. Aayush Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner(s) in both cases.

Mr. Gurpartap Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mukul Ahuja, Advocate
for the complainant in CRM-M-591-2026.

Mr. S.S. Aviraj, Advocate
for the complainant in CRM-M-2545-2026.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J.

1. Both aforementioned petitions have arisen out of same FIR,
therefore, same are taken up together for disposal. Further, documents



annexed in lead case i.e. CRM-M-591-2026 are referred for disposal of aforesaid petitions.

2. Petitioners Monika Parti and Nitin Parti have filed separate petitions under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of anticipatory bail in case FIR No. 0167 dated 29.11.2025 under Section 318, 351, 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 registered at Police Station Jodhewal, District Police Commissionerate Ludhiana (Annexure P-1).

3. As per the facts of case, Amit Thapar filed written complaint against Nitin Parti and his wife Monika Parti with allegations of committing fraud to the tune of Rs. 1,12,50,000/- with owners of different firms by purchasing hosiery material. It is alleged that Harjinder Singh - owner of M/s Vaheguru Knit Fab, Amit Thapar – owner of M/s Bhumi Creation, Navita Jain – owner of M/s S.R. Creations, Baldev Raj Malhotra – owner of M/s Samar Fabrics and Manoj Sharma – owner of M/s Asian Hosiery Works stated that they were doing the business of hosiery garments. Accused persons started purchasing hosiery garments from Harjinder Singh – owner of M/s Vaheguru Knit Fab during July, 2024 and at that time they claimed to be owners of 3-4 different firms. They suggested to purchase material in cash and after the end of year, they will obtain one final bill of material purchased. Initially, they purchased small quantity of material and made online payment. With the passage of time, their trust developed and thereafter, they purchased material in huge quantity worth Rs. 11 lakhs. While collecting material, they issued rough (kachhi) receipt. Accused



persons did not make payment till January, 2025. Complainant No. 1 raised demand for money several times, but they kept on avoiding by giving one excuse or the other and further stopped purchasing material from the firm of complainant No. 1. In similar fashion, accused persons purchased hosiery material worth Rs. 61 lakhs from M/s Bhumi Creation. They purchased hosiery garments in October, 2024 from M/s S.R. Creations worth Rs. 20 lakhs. In the year 2021, accused persons purchased material from M/s Samar Fabrics worth Rs. 12.50 lakhs. They had issued cheques for purchase of material from complainant No. 4 regarding which litigation is already going on. In July, 2020, they purchased material from M/s Asian Hosiery Works worth Rs. 8 lakhs. In this way, accused persons have total liability of Rs. 1,12,50,000/- towards the complainants. With the passage of time, complainants came to know that accused persons committed fraud with several firms in same manner. With these allegations, present FIR has been registered.

4. Learned counsel representing both petitioners conceded that accused/petitioners Monika Parti and Nitin Parti are husband and wife. Petitioner Monika Parti is a housewife. She has no concern with business. She is falsely implicated in this case. Even otherwise, matter in controversy is civil in nature. Complainants are claiming money on account of business transaction. Present FIR has been registered only to create pressure on petitioners. M/s Samar Fabrics has already filed civil suits against both petitioners seeking recovery of various amounts. Copies of complaints are Annexures P-3 and P-4. Similarly, Manoj Sharma, proprietor of Asian



Hosiery Works filed suit for recovery against Monika Parti. Copy of plaint is Annexure P-5. Petitioners Monika Parti and Nitin Parti were granted interim relief by the Coordinate Bench vide order(s) dated 12.01.2026 and 19.01.2026 respectively. They are always ready to join investigation and will cooperate with Investigating Agency.

5. Bail petitions are opposed by learned counsel representing State of Punjab assisted by learned counsel(s) representing complainant in both cases. It is pointed out that both petitioners have committed fraud with complainants as referred in FIR. They are involved in several cases, both civil and criminal in nature. They are avoiding process of law. They are also facing complaints filed under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, 1881. Considering the specific allegations and huge amount involved in this case, petitioners are not entitled to be released on anticipatory bail. Therefore, their bail petitions may be declined.

6. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. As detailed in FIR referred above, petitioners allegedly had business dealings with different firms as detailed therein. It is claimed that petitioners purchased hosiery material/garments worth huge amounts but did not pay the same. It has come on record that civil litigation has also started with some of the complainants seeking recovery of amount. Copies of interlocutory orders placed on record further show that various complaints are also filed against petitioner Nitin Parti. Civil and criminal cases instituted will be decided on its own merits. Apart from various other litigation started on account of business transaction, present FIR is also



lodged. Petitioners are ready to join investigation. Considering the aforesaid factual position and without expressing my mind on merits of the case, **anticipatory bail petitions i.e. CRM-M-591-2026 and CRM-M-2545-2026 filed by petitioners Monika Parti and Nitin Parti respectively are allowed.** They be not arrested. In case of their arrest, they be released on bail to the satisfaction of Arresting/Investigating Officer concerned, subject to condition that petitioners will join investigation as and when required. They will not tamper with or interfere with investigation and will not leave country without prior permission as provided under Section 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, in both cases, stand disposed of accordingly as well.
8. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case mentioned above.

29.04.2026
lalit

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

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