

2026:PHHC:072373



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

211

CRM-M-12902-2026

Date of decision : 08.05.2026

ANUPAMA KUMARI

..... PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB

..... RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Present : Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate with
Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rohit Bansal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nimanyu Gautam, Advocate
for the complainant.

SURYA PARTAP SINGH. J.(Oral)

1. This petition for pre-arrest bail is the first petition filed by the petitioner under Section 482 of 'the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023'. It has been filed with regard to a case arising out of FIR No.54 dated 21.04.2025, for the commission of offence punishable under Section 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, Police Station Sujanpur, District Pathankot.

2. Vide order dated 10.03.2026, the petitioner was admitted to interim anticipatory bail, subject to the condition of furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of arresting officer. It was also directed that the petitioner shall join the investigation.

3. Heard

4. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that in compliance with order dated 10.03.2026, the petitioner has already joined the investigation, and that nothing has been left to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. In view of above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has requested that the order dated 10.03.2026 be made absolute.

5. The learned State counsel being assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has controverted the above-mentioned arguments. It has been contended by learned State Counsel that in the present case although the petitioner has joined the investigation, but he has been non-cooperative with regard to recovery of money, which has been usurped by her by cheating more than 12 complainants. As per learned State counsel in view of above, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

6. The record has been perused carefully.

7. With regard to fact-situation of this case and the above-mentioned arguments, following are the relevant factors which are supposed to be taken into consideration:-

- i) that the petitioner has already joined the investigation;
- ii) that except the money nothing has to be recovered from the possession of petitioner. With regard to recovery of money which is not a piece of evidence in this case, the proper remedy available to the petitioner is before the Civil Court;
- iii) that the offence is triable by the Court of Judicial Magistrate;

- iv) that the benefit of anticipatory bail has already been accorded to the co-accused, and the case of the petitioner stands on the same footing;
- v) that the maximum punishment prescribed for the offence is imprisonment for seven years;
- vi) that the petitioner being a lady deserves a considerate view;
- vii) that the trial of the case is not likely to be concluded in near future;
- viii) that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not likely to produce a fruitful result;
- ix) that there is nothing on record to show that while on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioner is likely to tamper with the evidence or influence the witnesses;and
- x) that there is nothing on record to show that while on interim anticipatory bail, the petitioner will not participate/cooperate in the investigation.

8. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the petitioner has already join the investigation, the order dated 10.03.2026, whereby the petitioner was accorded the benefit of interim anticipatory bail, is hereby made absolute. The present petition stands **allowed**, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

08.05.2026

vipin

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether Reportable : No