

2026:PHHC:087161



107

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

**CRM-M-33337-2026 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 10.06.2026**

DIKSHA SHUKLA @ DEEKSHA SHUKLA

.....PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Kapish Singla, Advocate for the petitioner(s)

Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. Prayer

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, in FIR No. 26 dated 02.02.2026 registered at Police Station Sector-53, Gurugram, under Sections 316(2), 316(4), 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. Contention

On behalf of the petitioner

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated and has no role in the alleged transactions, which were

undertaken by employees of the complainant company. He submits that the petitioner was neither entrusted with any property of the company nor had any authority to operate accounts or process payments. It is further argued that the present FIR is a result of mala fide intentions, as the complainant started initiating multiple complaints after the petitioner's husband resigned from the company due to disputes regarding unpaid salary and other service benefits.

Learned counsel points out that identical allegations had earlier been investigated on several occasions and closure reports were submitted by the police after finding no substance therein. Despite repeated closure reports, the complainant succeeded in getting the present FIR registered, which itself reflects abuse of the criminal process. He further submits that the alleged transactions pertain to the years 2023–2024, whereas the FIR was registered only on 02.02.2026 without any plausible explanation for the considerable delay. Lastly, it is contended that the case is based entirely on documentary evidence already in possession of the investigating agency, no recovery is to be effected from the petitioner, and therefore custodial interrogation is not required.

Notice of motion.

On behalf of the State/complainant

On the asking of Court, Mr. Ved Parkash, Sr. DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent/State. He opposes the prayer for grant of bail stating that the petitioner is wife of the main accused namely Vaidehi Sharan Dixit and has actively connived with her husband in commission of the crime in question, therefore, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required.

3. **Analysis**

Be that as it may, having given due consideration to the submissions advanced, particularly to the fact the allegations against the petitioner are

primarily based on her alleged association with the main accused, namely her husband. The record reflects that similar complaints made by the complainant were earlier inquired into and closure reports were submitted. It is also not disputed that the alleged transactions pertain to the years 2023–2024, whereas the FIR came to be registered on 02.02.2026. The prosecution case is substantially based on documentary evidence, including bank records and company documents, which are already in possession of the investigating agency. No recovery is stated to be effected from the petitioner.

In the light of above, this Court is of the considered view that there is no valid or cogent reason to deny the bail to the present petitioner, wherein she has *bona fide* intentions and is ready and willing to join the investigation and cooperate for furtherance of the same so that the final report can be submitted by the Investigating Agency in time.

4. **Relief:-**

Hence, the petitioner is directed to be released on anticipatory bail subject to her joining investigation with the Investigating Officer concerned within a period of one week from today, on furnishing of personal/surety bonds to the satisfaction of Arresting Officer/Investigating Officer. The petitioner shall also abide by the terms and conditions as envisaged under Section 482(2) of BNSS, which are reproduced below:-

‘When the High Court or the Court of Session makes a direction under sub-section (1), it may include such conditions in such directions in the light of the facts of the particular case, as it may think fit, including-

(i) a condition that the person shall make himself available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;

(ii) a condition that the person 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 from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

(iii) a condition that the person shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

(iv) such other condition as may be imposed under sub-section (3) of section 480, as if the bail were granted under that section.'

However, it is made clear that in case the petitioner does not comply with the aforesaid direction of joining the investigation within a period of one week, the order passed by this Court today shall automatically stands cancelled.

In the aforesaid terms, the present petition stands allowed.

10.06.2026
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

:Yes/No
:Yes/No