



CRM-M-9806-2026 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

209

CRM-M-9806-2026
Date of decision: 20.05.2026

MALKEET KAUR KANG

.....PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA

. RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present: Ms. Ankita Ahuja, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Asstt. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate with
Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

1. This petition for bail is the third petition, filed by the petitioner under Section 483 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. This petition has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.558 dated



20.07.2024, for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 406 & 420 of Indian Penal Code, Police Station Shahabad, District Kurukshetra.

2. The FIR of this case came into being at the instance of 'Gurjeet Kaur', hereinafter being referred to as "complainant" only. It was stated by the above-named complainant that her husband and husband of 'Malkeet Kaur' were known to each other and that she was residing along with her husband and daughter at Duabi. According to complainant 'Malkeet Kaur' and Satnam Singh gained her trust by proposing a marriage alliance between their son, Navpreet Singh and her daughter. The complainant further stated that between 2018 and 2023, the petitioner and her husband won her confidence and induced her to hand over Rs.18,00,00/- in cash and 30 tolas of gold. The gold was purportedly taken under the pretext of securing a loan, with a promise to return it within six months. The loan has since been declared a non-performing asset (NPA). The complainant further stated that when she asked for her assets back, the petitioner blackmailed her, stating that the marriage between their children would only proceed if the complainant continued to pay the EMIs on the gold loan.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to above-mentioned complaint, formal FIR of this case was lodged and the investigation taken up.

4. Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate appears on behalf of complainant. He has filed a memo of appearance. The same be taken on record.

5. Reply and custody certificate have been filed by learned State counsel. The same, too, be taken on record.

6. Heard.

7. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that



although this is third petition for bail filed by the petitioner, but on account of long incarceration of the petitioner in a case which is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate and wherein there is no progress in trial, the petitioner is eligible to file this petition for regular bail.

8. The record has been perused carefully.
9. A perusal of record shows that the first petition filed by the petitioner for bail was dismissed on 01.05.2025, and thereafter, the second petition came to be dismissed on 08.12.2025. On first occasion when the bail petition was dismissed on 01.05.2025, it was specifically recorded by the Court that after arguments for sometime, the above-mentioned petition was withdrawn. The above-mentioned contents of the order shows that the merits of the case was considered by the Court on that day.
10. From the date of dismissal of second bail petition no significant change in prevailing circumstances has taken place. Thus, it is hereby observed that the present petition which is third petition for bail is not maintainable and deserves dismissal. The same is hereby **dismissed** accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

20.05.2026

vipin

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