

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026:PHHC:081422



204

CRM-M-24958-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision:22.05.2026

Lakshmi @ Jassi Nahar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Sakshi Bakshi, AAG, Punjab.

...

Manisha Batra, J. (Oral).

1. The instant petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking benefit of anticipatory bail in case arising out of FIR No.21, dated 01.02.2024, under Sections 379, 506 read with Section 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Basti Bawa Khel, District Jalandhar on the basis of statement recorded by the complainant - Ramesh Kumar alleging therein that he was employed as a driver of vehicle bearing PB74-C-5562 and the registered owner of this vehicle was Sukhwinder Sahota. He used to park his car in front of his house as registered owner of the vehicle had no space to park the car. It was alleged by the complainant that his wife- Lakshmi @ Jassi i.e. the present petitioner had illicit relations with co-accused Gulshan @ Gulchaman. On 25.02.2023, a fight had taken place between the complainant and the present petitioner and on that day co-accused Gulshan

@ Gulchaman was also present. Thereafter, he and the present petitioner had taken away the aforementioned car and even the complainant was thrown out of the house along with his son. Therefore, he prayed for taking action against them.

2. After registration of FIR, investigation proceedings have been initiated and are underway. Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner had moved an application for pre-arrest bail, which had been dismissed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Jalandhar vide order dated 26.03.2025.

3. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that she has been falsely implicated in this case. The allegations of her committing theft of the vehicle belonging to the employer of the complainant, are totally false. The car in question is in possession of the registered owner itself. She has been implicated on account of her disputes with her husband. The co-accused has been extended benefit of pre-arrest bail. On parity, she too deserves to be extended the same benefit. It is, therefore, argued that the petition deserves to be allowed.

4. Status report has been filed. Learned State counsel has argued that taking into consideration the gravity of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the fact that the stolen vehicle is to be recovered from the petitioner, she does not deserve to be extended the benefit of bail. It is also argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender being involved in several other cases and is having criminal antecedents. There are chances of her committing similar offences, if extended benefit of pre-arrest bail. It is, therefore, stressed that the petition does not deserve to be allowed.

5. This Court has heard the rival submissions made by learned

counsel for the parties.

6. The petitioner along with co-accused is alleged to have committed the theft of vehicle which as per the complainant belong to his employer Sukhwinder Sahota. There is delay in reporting the matter to the police. The co-accused has already joined investigation and no recovery was effected from him. The registered owner of the vehicle did not lodge any FIR qua theft of his car. Given the nature of the allegations as levelled against the petitioner and the circumstances peculiar to this case, this Court is of the considered opinion that pre-trial incarceration of the petitioner is not required. As such, a case for grant of pre-arrest bail in favour of the petitioner is made out. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be extended benefit of anticipatory bail, subject to her joining investigation and surrendering within a period of 10 days from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order and upon her doing so, she shall be released on bail by the **Investigating Officer** on furnishing personal as well surety bonds to his satisfaction and further subject to following conditions:-

(i) the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation and shall appear before the investigating officer/arresting officer as and when required.

(ii) she shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

(iii) she shall not commit any similar offence while on bail.

7. In case of violation of any of the above conditions, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider the application for cancellation, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

8. It is, however, clarified that the observations made above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the case and shall not influence the outcome of the trial in any manner.

9. Since the main petition has been allowed, pending application, if any, is rendered infructuous.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

22.05.2026

harjeet

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