



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

203-1

CRM-M-5566-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.04.2026

Gagandeep Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

203-2

CRM-M-5588-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.04.2026

Amandeep Kaur

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG Punjab.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Both these petitions, filed by two accused/petitioners, for grant of anticipatory bail in case bearing FIR No.174 dated 22.12.2025, registered under Section(s) 420/465/467/468/471/120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Jodhewal, Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana, are being decided by this common order. The references are, however, being taken from *CRM-M-5566-2026* titled as '*Gagandeep Kaur Vs. State of Punjab and another*'.

203-1
203-2

CRM-M-5566-2026 (O&M)
CRM-M-5588-2026 (O&M)

2. When on 16.03.2026, the matter had come up for hearing before this Court, the following order was passed:-

“Petitioner, an accused in case FIR No.174 dated 22.12.2025 registered against her, under Sections 420/465/467/468/471/120-B IPC, at Police Station Basti Jodhewal, Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana has filed the petition for grant of pre-arrest bail under Section 482 of BNSS.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the daughter of the petitioner namely Pavneet Kaur was employed in 2020 in the company of respondent No.2-complainant, as an Accountant Assistant at a salary of Rs.12,000/- per month. Respondent No.2 employed certain migrant labourers, who did not have their own bank accounts as such daughter of the petitioner and others employees of the company were asked to get their salary earning remitted into their bank accounts and later to transfer the same by withdrawing through cash or UPI transactions. Initially daughter of the petitioner refused to get such money into her account but she was coerced to do so by respondent No.2 on the ground of security of her job. Owing to financial constraints daughter of the petitioner acceded to these illegal demands. It has been alleged that Pavneet Kaur, who is daughter of petitioner, transferred Rs.12,87,604/- in the various bank accounts of the petitioner with different banks.

Learned counsel next contends that petitioner has no role to play in the entire incident. She is home-maker and was totally

203-1
203-2

CRM-M-5566-2026 (O&M)
CRM-M-5588-2026 (O&M)

unaware that money had been credited in her account. It is further the submission of learned counsel that the story as put forth by the complainant in the FIR even otherwise sounds highly improbable/unbelievable, for it does not 'gel' with the common sense that labourers who were working in the company of respondent No.2 and were dependent on their day to day earnings did not complain for almost 03 years even though they were not paid their salary. Further it also sounds improbable that the alleged cheating escaped attention of the auditors at the time of annual audit.

Learned counsel contends that in fact the present FIR is a counterblast to the complaint lodged by the daughter of the petitioner, who was wanting to leave her job but was compelled by respondent No.2 to stay put. Even her mobile phone etc. were also taken away by respondent No.2.

Towards the end learned counsel contends that daughter of the petitioner who allegedly is the main accused has been granted the concession of bail by the Ld. JMIC, Ludhiana vide order dated 05.01.2026 (Annexure P2). It has been prayed that petitioner is not in any which way involved in this incident and has been unnecessarily dragged in but is willing to join the investigation as and when called for.

Heard. Documents on record perused.

Notice of motion.

203-1
203-2

CRM-M-5566-2026 (O&M)
CRM-M-5588-2026 (O&M)

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State. He seeks time to file the status report.

Adjourned to 21.04.2026.

Till then no coercive steps be taken against the petitioner.”

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the petitioners are the mother and sister of Pavneet Kaur, who was employed as Manager (HR) with M/s Ganpati Overseas Industries Private Limited. It is contended that the allegations in the FIR are primarily directed against the said Pavneet Kaur for having embezzled certain amounts from the accounts of the company. Learned counsel submits that certain amounts are alleged to have been transferred by Pavneet Kaur into the bank accounts of the present petitioners; however, the petitioners had no knowledge of any alleged wrongdoing and had received the said amounts in good faith, without being aware of their alleged illicit origin. He submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners would not be required as the entire case rests upon documentary evidence, including bank transactions, which are already within the knowledge and possession of the investigating agency. Learned counsel also submits that, even though interim orders restraining the respondent(s) from taking any coercive steps had been passed by this Court, nonetheless the petitioners were called by the investigation agency and they joined the investigation.

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the facts as stated above.

5. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

203-1
203-2

CRM-M-5566-2026 (O&M)
CRM-M-5588-2026 (O&M)

respective parties and have gone through the documents appended with the instant petition, with their able assistance.

6. In view of the foregoing facts and circumstances, more particularly the nature of allegations, the role attributed to the petitioners being limited to receipt of amounts transferred by the principal accused, the case resting substantially on documentary evidence already within the possession of the investigating agency, as well as the fact that the petitioners have joined the investigation and extended full cooperation, this Court is of the opinion that their custodial interrogation is not warranted.

7. In view of the above, the instant petitions are ***allowed***. The petitioners are hereby ordered to be released on bail on furnishing of bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the investigating officer.

8. Needless to mentions that the petitioners shall continue to appear before the Investigation Agency for further investigation as and when required to do so. In the event of the petitioners joining and not extending full cooperation with the investigating agency, the investigating agency would be liberty to move an appropriate application for cancellation of bail.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

21.04.2026

Mangal Singh

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