



CRM-M-3850-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

277

CRM-M-3850-2026
Decided on: 02.07.2026

Satya Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Jaspal Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner (through V.C.)

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG Punjab

Mr. Sandeep Godara, Advocate for
Mr. APS Rehan, Advocate
for the complainant

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in this petition, filed under Section 482 of the BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438 Cr.P.C.), is for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, who has been booked in a criminal case arising out of FIR No.270 dated 01.12.2025, under Sections 316(2), 318(4) of BNS (Sections 336(2), 338, 340(2), 61(2) of BNS added later on) registered at Police Station Tanda, District Hoshiarpur.

2. On 25.03.2026, following order was passed:

“(i) xx xx xx xx

(ii) *Briefly stated, the facts of the case are that the complainant Gurminder Singh alleged that he was induced by co-accused Satya Kaur and Jasvir Singh on the pretext of securing admission of his children in Shri Guru Ram Dass Medical College, Amritsar. It is alleged that the said accused demanded huge amounts and received approximately Rs.40 lakhs from the complainant on different occasions. Thereafter, the complainant was introduced to co-accused Rajwinder*

**CRM-M-3850-2026**

Singh and Shafi Mohammad, who also represented that they would facilitate the admission process under the ministry quota and kept the complainant informed about the progress of the admission. It is further alleged that the accused persons showed certain documents purportedly signed by authorities, which later turned out to be false, and despite assurances, neither admission was secured nor the amount was returned. Thus, all the accused are alleged to have acted in connivance and cheated the complainant, whereas the role attributed to Shafi Mohammad is limited to having joined the co-accused subsequently and making representations regarding the process of admission.

(iii) Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the matter has now been amicably compromised between the parties and the entire amount stands paid to the complainant.

(iv) Counsel for the respondent-complainant is also present in Court. He has filed the power of attorney and has stated that the matter has been compromised and that he has no objection in case anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner. However, learned State counsel has opposed the petition on the ground that serious allegations have been levelled against the petitioner.

(v) Considering the fact that the dispute between the parties has been amicably settled, the entire amount is stated to have been paid, and the complainant himself has no objection to the grant of anticipatory bail, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has made out a case for grant of interim anticipatory bail.

(vi) Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation as and when called by the Investigating Officer and in the event of her arrest, she shall be released on interim anticipatory bail to the satisfaction of the Arresting/Investigating Officer, subject to the conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 [Section 438(2) Cr.P.C]. The petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall not tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses in any manner.

(vii) List on 17.04.2026 for further consideration.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to the directions issued by this Court vide order dated 25.03.2026, the petitioner has joined investigation and otherwise also states that during the pendency of the present petition, the parties have compromised the matter, however, statements in terms of quashing petition are yet to be recorded.

**CRM-M-3850-2026**

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel and learned counsel for the complainant also confirm the factum of compromise between the parties and that the petitioner has joined the investigation, and as of now, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation.

4. Since, petitioner has already joined the investigation and custodial interrogation is no more required; ad-interim bail order dated 25.03.2026 passed by this Court is hereby made absolute. Accordingly, present petition is allowed.

5. The petitioner shall continue to join the investigation as and when required to do so and abide by all the terms and conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023.

6. However, present order would be subject to the submission of her passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if she possesses, within a period of one week from today. Otherwise, she would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that she does not possess any passport.

7. It is clarified that in case, aforesaid condition is not complied with, this order would be considered as *non est* automatically.

02.07.2026

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**Whether Speaking/Reasoned:
Whether Reportable:**YES/NO
~~YES~~/NO**