



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

(112)

CRM-M-11875-2026

DATE OF DECISION: 10.03.2026

Isha @ Nisha @ Nishu

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Yashpal Thakur, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr.DAG, Haryana.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023 for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in case FIR No.37 dated 09.03.2025, under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 61(2) (Sections 338, 336(3) and 340(2) of BNS, 2023 added lateron), registered at Police Station Panjokhra, District Ambala, Haryana.

2. Brief facts of the case are that present FIR was registered on the complaint of complainant Tejinder Singh that he was married with co-accused Kajal Kaur; co-accused Jagjit Kaur and her son namely Amarjit Singh had introduced the complainant and his family with the mediators namely Sukhwinder Singh and Manju (co-accused). It has been further alleged that three-four days prior to the marriage, co-accused Sonia and Shamsher made a telephonic call to the sister of the complainant and stated that co-accused Paramjit Kaur and Kajal Kaur are in need of Rs.1,50,000/- and that they will return the amount after the marriage and the said amount was given to them. After solemnization of marriage, the complainant came



to know that co-accused Kajal Kaur is drug addict, does not belong to Jat Sikh Caste and has entered into many such previous marriages with the intention to dupe the boys side. That she has allegedly misappropriated gold and cash amounting to Rs.5 lakhs of the complainant. On the basis of these facts and on the basis of certain other ancillary facts, the present FIR registered. Co-accused were arrested in the present FIR on 20.03.2025 and during police remand, co-accused, in pursuance to their disclosure statements got recovered Rs.33,000/- out of Rs.1,50,000/-.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case as there is no specific allegations against her; even co-accused Jagjeet Kaur has been granted anticipatory bail by the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, vide order dated 08.04.2025 (Annexure P-4) whereas co-accused Sonia and Shamsher have been granted regular bail by the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, vide order dated 16.04.2025 (Annexure P-3). Hence, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Notice of motion.

5. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Senior DAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court accepted notice on behalf of respondent-State and opposed the bail petition by submitting that petitioner is a member of an organized gang involved in fake marriages to cheat people; that the present petitioner has actively participated in negotiation and solemnization of the marriage and impersonated herself as mother of the main accused Kajal Kaur while she is not her real mother; she also prepared



a forged Aadhar Card to show herself as mother of the co-accused Kajal Kaur, and the same was submitted at the time of Anand Karaj at Gurudwara; petitioner along with co-accused cheated the complainant and his family with 5 tolas of gold and petitioner also received her share from the cheated amount; it is the third marriage of co-accused Kajal Kaur within a span of three years; her custodial interrogation is required for recovery of the amount as well as to collect the evidence for the success of the prosecution case.

6. Heard.

7. Keeping in view the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned State counsel and the facts and circumstances of the case and the role assigned to the present petitioner that she is member of an organized racket for solemnization of fake marriages to dupe people; present petitioner impersonated as mother of bride; it is the third marriage of the co-accused Kajal Kaur within a span of three years as per the contention of the learned State counsel, the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation for recovery of the duped amount as well as for the collection of the evidence for the success of the prosecution case. So, the petitioner is not entitled for grant of discretionary relief of anticipatory bail.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasised the importance of custodial interrogation *in case titled as 'CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806' decided on 03.08.1997*, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in



CRM-M-11875-2026 4

custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

9. In view of the above, this Court finds no merit in the present petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

10. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

10.03.2026	(SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No