



102

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-18364-2025 (O&M)

SARABJEET KAURPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

CRM-M-19617-2025

KULTAR SINGHPETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJABRESPONDENT

DECIDED ON: 23.03.2026

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

Present: Ms. Savita Devi, Advocate, and
Mr. Gurudupinder Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioners (in both the cases).

Mr. Neeraj Madaan, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Abnash Singh, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

1. By this common order, both the aforementioned petitions,
i.e. CRM-M-18364-2025 and CRM-M-19617-2025 shall stand disposed
of.
2. Present petitions have been filed by the petitioners, seeking
grant of anticipatory bail, in case, FIR No.180, dated 20.08.2024, under
Sections 406, 420, 120-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Division
No.6, Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.



3. Learned State counsel has filed status reports dated 10.09.2025 (in both the cases) in the Court today and the same are taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

4. Both the petitioners are related to each other as husband and wife.

5. As per the allegations, and as detailed in the status report, an amount of Rs.18 lakhs is stated to have been received by both the petitioners, and the said assertion is sought to be substantiated through photographs/video recordings allegedly showing the petitioners counting the said amount.

However, neither the status report nor the submissions made during the course of arguments, clarify whether the aforesaid amount of Rs.18 lakhs, or any other amount, was ever credited to the bank accounts of the petitioners.

6. Further, allegation against the petitioners is that they were actively involved in collecting cash payments from the complainant while misrepresenting the process of securing foreign *visas*.

7. The primary contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioners is that owner of the firm, namely Harpinder Khara, proprietor of Wood Bridge Overseas Consultant Private Limited, has not been arrayed as an accused in the present case, till date.

Rather, as per learned State counsel, investigation *qua* him is still ongoing.



8. It is a matter of concern that, in cases involving monetary disputes, investigations are often kept pending, particularly with respect to the main accused. In the present case as well, neither the owner of the firm has been made an accused, nor he has been joined in the investigation.

On the other hand, petitioners have been arrested despite the fact that neither learned State counsel nor counsel for the complainant has been able to point to any material on record indicating deposit of the alleged amount in the petitioners' bank accounts, corresponding to the period during which the payments were allegedly made.

9. Whether the amount reflected in the photographs/video recordings, allegedly being counted by the petitioners, pertains to the transaction in question or was intended for the owner of the firm for the purposes referred to in the FIR, is a matter to be determined during the course of investigation or trial.

10. In the light of the above, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by subjecting the petitioners to custodial interrogation, particularly when the allegations are required to be established primarily through documentary evidence, including bank records.

11. **Thus, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of both the present petitions,** by directing the petitioners 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, petitioners would be released on anticipatory bail, subject to their furnishing bail bonds to the



satisfaction of the Arresting Officer. The petitioners shall also be abide by all the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.).

12. Besides, it is directed that petitioners would hand over their passport to the Investigating Agency or to Court concerned, if they possess. Otherwise, would submit an affidavit, disclosing the fact that they do not possess any passport.

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

13. With the reasons recorded here above, both the present petitions stand disposed of.

14. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

23.03.2026
Lavisha

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

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