



CRM-M-15423-2026

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

183

CRM-M-15423-2026
Decided on: 24.03.2026

Sukhwinder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Nilesh Bhardwaj, Advocate and
Ms. Vanshika Daaria, Advocate, for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate
for the complainant.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.0274, dated 05.11.2025, under Sections 61, 316, 318 of BNS (corresponding to sections 120-B, 406, 420 of IPC), registered at Police Station Sector 14, District Panchkula.

2. Factual position as alleged against the petitioner and other accused by complainant-Surender Kumar, ACP, Sector-14, Panchkula, as recorded in order dated 23.03.2026 passed in CRM-M-71024-2025 is as follows:

3. As per allegations, the same residential property, i.e., House No.233, Sector 26, Panchkula, on the strength of a Will, was agreed to be purchased by the complainant – Surender Singh, who at the relevant time (from 16.03.2022 to 06.10.2023) was posted as Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sector 14, Panchkula.



4. Primarily, there are six accused, namely, (i) Bharat Pal, (ii) Aarti Devi (sister-in-law), (iii) Naib Singh (son), (iv) Sukhwinder Kaur (daughter-in-law), (v) Kulwinder Singh Puwel (in possession of the property), and (vi) Raj Kumar Bhatia, Advocate (petitioner herein). Property, which was valued at Rs.2.5 crores, allured to befor sale for Rs.1.5 crore, however, later on was agreed to be sold to the complainant for a sum of Rs.2.0 crores. For finalizing the sale, an amount of Rs.53,05,000/- was paid by the complainant to accused Bharat Pal and his family members, including Naib Singh and Sukhwinder Kaur. Later, an amount of Rs.6.00 lakhs was returned by Bharat Pal and, therefore, at the time of registration of the FIR, a sum of Rs.47,05,000/- remained with the accused persons.”

3. Co-accused-Raj Kumar Bhatia has already been granted concession of anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 16.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-71024-2025. While both the petitions were listed together (Raj Kumar Bhatia and petitioner Sukhwinder Kaur) for its hearing on 23.03.2026 and on even date following was recorded in the present petition:

“1. Present petition has been filed by the petitioner, seeking grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.0274, dated 05.11.2025, under Sections 61, 316, 318 of BNS (corresponding to sections 120-B, 406, 420 of IPC), registered at Police Station Sector 14, District Panchkula.

2. Co-accused Raj Kumar Bhatia, has already been granted the concession of interim anticipatory bail by this Court, vide order dated 16.12.2025 passed in CRM-M-71024-2025 (Annexure P-4).

3. Notice of motion.

4. On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana, puts an appearance on behalf of the respondent/State, and Ms. Pranhita Singh, Advocate, puts an appearance on behalf of the complainant.

5. List again on 23.03.2026, to file status report in the matter.

6. To be heard along with CRM-M-71024-2025.

7. Meanwhile, petitioner shall not be arrested. However, issue of joining of investigation by the petitioner would be examined on the next date of hearing, after reviewing the status report, which is yet to be filed by learned State counsel.”



CRM-M-15423-2026

2. Continuing the submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner – Sukhwinder Kaur w/o Naib Singh s/o Bharat Pal, submits that from her joint account with her husband, on asking of her father-in-law – Bharat Pal, amount of Rs.15.00 lakhs (deposited in PNB A/c No.4673000100020612), had been transferred by the complainant. However, there is no specific allegation that the petitioner had ever demanded any amount or directly proposed the sale of any property to the complainant. The primary allegations are against the co-accused – Bharat Pal, who is already inside the jail after being arrested by the Investigating Agency.

It is further submitted that the co-account holder, namely Naib Singh (husband of the petitioner), had already expired in the year 2023. Besides, amount of Rs.15.00 lakhs, which was transferred into the account of the petitioner, has already been withdrawn by her father-in-law – Bharat Pal.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner prays for grant of some time to seek instructions with regard to deposit of the said amount in the shape of FDR before the learned trial Court.

4. List again on **24.03.2026**.

To be taken up at **2:00 P.M.**”

4. While giving explanation of total deposited amount of Rs. 15 lacs in the joint bank account of the petitioner No. 4673000100020612 belonging to Sukhwinder Kaur and her husband Naib Singh on 15.01.2024, amount of Rs. 15 lacs was transferred in that bank account by complainant Surender Kumar and thereupon total amount of Rs. 2 lacs (four times) was transferred in personal bank account of petitioner Sukhwinder Kaur and Rs. 9 lacs was transferred in the bank account of one Vinod Jindal (not an accused in the present case), another sum of Rs. 2,50,000/- (in three installments) was transferred in the bank account of main accused Bharat Pal. Thus, as per allegations remaining amount is of Rs. 47,05,000/- and as informed by learned Additional A.G. only Rs. 1,49,551/- was used for clearing already existing loan against the petitioner and her deceased husband. Thus, broadly speaking out of total Rs. 15 lacs transferred in the bank

**CRM-M-15423-2026**

account of petitioner, only Rs. 2 lacs was transferred in her personal bank account. Therefore, at this stage, unless allegation of connivance of each one of the accused with main accused Bharat Pal is established that too beyond doubt, it can not be assumed that there is any active role of the petitioner being a simple and household lady.

5. Considering all the circumstances as discussed in the aforementioned order and also in the co-accused bail order (Raj Kumar Bhatia anticipatory bail petition), I do not find any substantial reason for subjecting the petitioner to custodial interrogation, petitioner deserves the concession of anticipatory bail

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to join the investigation within two weeks from today, or as and when called by the investigating agency, and in the eventuality of the arrest, petitioner would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to his furnishing bail bonds to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioner shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

7. Besides, it is directed that petitioner would hand over his passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if he possesses. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that he does not possess any passport.

It is also directed that before leaving country any time during trial, petitioner would seek prior permission of the Court.

8. With the directions issued here above, present petition stands disposed of.

24.03.2026

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**



CRM-M-15423-2026

Whether Speaking/Reasoned:	YES/ NO
Whether Reportable:	YES /NO